

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE fourth volume of THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS has been published, and now a third of the work is in our hands. These four volumes have all been issued within four years, which is just half the length of time it took to publish the same number of volumes of *The Dictionary of the Bible*. And yet there is more matter in each volume of THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS, and more work on the part of the contributors and the editors. But the editors' staff is now larger; and fuller experience produces quicker as well as better results.

How is an Encyclopædia made? First of all the need for it has to be realized. Next a clear conception has to be formed in the mind of the editor. He has to determine what is to be the character of the work, and what its scope. Then a list of the topics to be included in it has to be prepared. In the case of a Dictionary of the Bible it is easy enough to prepare a list of topics. There are dictionaries in existence, and all that a new editor has to do is to work over the best of them, and see whether any of the entries are unnecessary, and whether any entries are wanting; more especially whether recent scholarship has brought any topics to the front which were not recognized before. That is comparatively plain sailing. In the case of THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS, the editor was confronted with the serious

fact that there was no such work in existence. No one apparently had conceived the idea of bringing all religion within the compass of one book. Where were the subjects found?

They were found at first in books. A whole library of books was ransacked for them, and a first tentative list was made out. This list was then separated into parts. Out of it were formed a Semitic and Egyptian list, a Christian list, a Buddhist list, a Muhammadan list, a Greek and Roman list, a Persian list, a Primitive list. Of each of these lists copies were made, and these copies were sent to men who were authorities in the particular department of study. A copy of the Semitic list was sent to Driver, one to Nöldeke, to Goldziher, Sayce, Barton, Paton, Pinches, and others. Copies of the Buddhist list were similarly sent to Buddhist scholars; and so with all the rest. An Ethical and Psychological list was also made out separately and sent to Baldwin, Dörner, Eucken, Iverach, Lloyd Morgan, Paulsen, Sorley, Royce, Arthur Thomson, and others. When these men received their copy, they went over it, scoring out redundancies, supplying deficiencies, marking words they wished to write upon, suggesting authors for other topics.

These lists returned, the editor went over them, one by one and word by word. He brought them



together again, and made out a comprehensive list, covering the whole field of Religion and Ethics. But there was still much to do and many books to read before the list was complete and ready for the assigning of the articles to their authors. When, however, it was ready, the most difficult step in the making of the Encyclopædia was accomplished.

In finding authors for the articles the editor was greatly indebted to the individual lists which had been returned. Altogether this part of the work proved easier than had been anticipated. The best men were found willing to undertake such subjects as fell within their province. No man was invited to take up anything that he had not already studied. It may be noticed that in the four volumes now issued, a considerable proportion of the writers contribute but one article. The founder of the Church Army is an authority on the Church Army and nothing else. The founder of Christian Endeavour is an authority on Christian Endeavour. And when more than one article comes from one contributor the range is strictly defined. Professor De GROOT touches nothing that is not Chinese; Professor NÖLDEKE will not move beyond the bounds of Ancient Arabia.

When an article arrives it is submitted to 'preparation for the press.' At this stage what is known as the 'blue pencil' is in evidence, sometimes much in evidence, sometimes, however, very little. For there are men who were born to write in encyclopædias: they write clearly and yet succinctly; they arrange their matter in the best order, they themselves suggest the passages that may be thrown into small type. There are other men, however, who are not born to do these things and never learn to do them. After the blue pencil has done its work, the article is typewritten and several copies of the typescript are taken. A copy is sent to the author, who goes over it with interest and returns it,—sometimes with remarks. A copy is also read by each of five editors. The corrections made on all these copies are then transferred

to one copy, which is sent to press. The article has at last reached the hands of the printer.

Eight copies are made of what is called the 'first proof.' The author receives two; he reads and returns one, and retains the other for reference. The editors read their copies. Again the whole is transferred to one copy and sent back to the printer. The next proof is in page form. The same process of reading is gone over again and the pages are returned to the printer. This is done three or four times, in some cases five or six times, before the sheet is finally passed for printing off.

But what does the proof-reading on the part of the editors mean? It means in the case of THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS the reading of every word in the article with the most scrupulous care. It means the verifying of every reference and every quotation contained in it. For although the author is chosen as the greatest authority on the subject, his work is read on the supposition that he is fallible. Every statement that he makes is subjected to scrutiny; every man's name, the title of every book, every date and place of publication is submitted to independent verification. Errors which can be corrected by the means at the editors' disposal are corrected, the author, of course, seeing the correction that is made and accepting it. When a reference cannot be verified and there is the least suspicion of its correctness, the author's attention is in every case drawn to it, and the sheet is kept till the editor is satisfied. For an Encyclopædia which cannot be trusted in matters of fact is not worth publishing.

Three things are kept steadily before the editors' minds: first, the aim of the work; next, its reliability; lastly, its readability. Of the first two something has been said; the last is worth a sentence or two also. A reviewer of the first volume (it was that acute scholar who contributes a literary article every week to *The Methodist*



*Recorder*) remarked humorously that there were authors in it who never wrote so well before. For the editor holds that it is time the reproach of unreadableness were removed from encyclopædias. The articles are condensed, but a condensed article should be more easily and more agreeably read than a profuse or prolix article. It depends upon simple things. Are the sentences complete, the syntax correct, the paragraphs in order, the style characteristic of the author and suitable to the theme? In short, is it really good idiomatic English? The editor has counted it part of his business to see that it is. And, greatest triumph of all, the translations are indistinguishable from original English writing.

---

What is the use of this Encyclopædia? What is its use to a preacher?

---

It contains all that a preacher has to preach. It contains all the Christian doctrine, and all the Christian ethics. It sets aside as unnecessary a whole library of books through which the preacher has to wade in order to know what the message of the gospel is and how that message may be proclaimed with most power. It makes vague notions definite—vague notions of Christ and Christianity, of faith and love, of individual responsibility, of fellowship with God and man. It makes wrong-thinking right, and it brings all right-thinking into order.

---

But the Encyclopædia does more for the man than for the preacher. Before we can preach we must *be*. Men who have passed the prime of their life are afraid of this Encyclopædia. Their doctrine is determined long ago. They may find difficulty in making it interesting now from day to day, but they cannot change it. For change in the doctrine means first of all change in the man. The whole religious outlook has altered within a generation, and a man who is past fifty must be changed in his whole mental equipment to understand and to make use of it. Words like 'psychology' and 'sociology' mark the

change somewhat, but there is no word which marks it as does the word 'religion.'

---

In the *Ethics of the Dust*, RUSKIN has a passage which gives promise of that spring which he scarcely saw even as spring and which only now is passing into summer. He introduces it with the anecdote (which he tells us in the preface is true) of the child of three whose friend had gone abroad. 'The morning after Alice had gone, Dotty was very sad and restless when she got up, and went about, looking into all the corners, as if she could find Alice in them, and at last she came to me, and said, "Is Alie gone over the great sea?" And I said, "Yes, she is gone over the great, deep sea, but she will come back again some day." Then Dotty looked round the room; and I had just poured some water out into the basin; and Dotty ran to it, and got up on a chair, and dashed her hands through the water, again and again; and cried, "Oh, deep, deep sea! send little Alie back to me!"'

---

Says RUSKIN: 'The whole heart of Greek mythology is in that; the idea of a personal being in the elemental power;—of its being moved by prayer; and of its presence everywhere, making the broken diffusion of the element sacred.'

---

What leads him to tell this anecdote? It is the discovery, which RUSKIN may not have been the first and certainly has not been the last to make, that the more definite our own faith is, we are the more ready to appreciate the faith of others; the more firmly we grasp the facts and principles of our own religion, the more do we see the necessity of understanding what religion means to other nations. 'I assure you,' he says, 'strange as it may seem, our scorn of Greek tradition depends, not on our belief, but our disbelief, of our own traditions.' And again, 'Do not think you will ever get harm by striving to enter into the faith of others, and to sympathize, in imagina-



tion, with the guiding principles of their lives. So only can you justly love them, or pity them, or praise.'

---

No doubt to the preacher who lives from hand to mouth, **RUSKIN** and Religion are together both barred and banned. God forgive him and us that any preacher should have to live from hand to mouth. Certain it is that such preaching must be nothing, of no more efficacy for the coming of the Kingdom than the twittering of the sparrows on the church roof. If the preaching is to be anything, the man must be more than the preacher. In short, he must be a man of God, fully furnished unto every good work. And this **THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS** seeks to do for him.

---

It is some time since we had a volume of the series which goes by the name of 'American Lectures on the History of Religions.' The best known volumes of the series are *Brinton's Primitive Religions* and *Cheyne's Life after the Exile*. The new volume is on *Babylonia and Assyria*, its exact title being *Aspects of Religious Belief and Practice in Babylonia and Assyria* (Putnam; 9s. net). Its author is Professor **MORRIS JASTROW, Jun., Ph.D.**, of the University of Pennsylvania.

---

Throughout the volume, which is a substantial octavo of nearly 500 pages, there runs a distinction which is new in the study of Babylonian and Assyrian religion, although it is of the utmost importance. It is the distinction between the religion of the people and the religion of the priests. Perhaps we might express the distinction roughly by saying that the religion of the people was religion mixed with magic, while the religion of the priests was religion modified by theological speculation. It is a distinction which is seen most clearly in the views that were held of the state of the dead. And the moment we see how unmistakable is the distinction in *Babylonia*, we are compelled to ask whether there was not a like distinction in *Israel*.

We are compelled to ask if the Book of *Ecclesiastes*, for example, tells us what was passing through the minds of the people of *Israel*. Professor **JASTROW** does not think it does. He thinks that we are nearer the mind of the people when we read the story of the witch of *Endor* than when we pursue the religious speculations of the Preacher. But the distinction is more difficult to make in *Israel* than among the *Babylonians*. In *Israel* we have little besides the Bible to work with, and we cannot tell very easily how much of the Bible is folk-belief and how much priestly modification. But in *Babylonia* there are texts and tablets of unadulterated folk-lore, so that the two forms of religion can be separated and set side by side.

---

It was the belief of the people of *Babylonia* that, after this life has come to an end, men and women continue to exist in a conscious or semi-conscious state. It is not an enviable condition. The dead are condemned to inactivity, and it is an inactivity that carries with it the loss of all that has made life worth living. Deep down in the bowels of the earth they are huddled together in a cave. The place is dark, gloomy, and damp. In one poetic work it is described as a neglected and forlorn palace where dust has been allowed to gather. There are slight modifications of this belief. The dwelling-place of the dead is sometimes pictured as a great city, and sometimes, curiously enough, as if it were the temple of a god. But whatever the name or metaphor used, all the sources emphasize the darkness and gloom of the abode of the dead. It is just such a place as *Job* has in mind when he says (10<sup>22</sup>) that there even 'the light is as darkness.' Nor is there any return from it. Once and again the shade of some dead man may rise up to earth in order to trouble the living. But it is only to return, after a short visit, to that land of darkness from which there is no escape for ever.

---

This was the belief of the people, and all their belief; it was not all the belief of the priests. By



speculation, or revelation if you will; by contact, perhaps, in later years with foreign thinking, the priests of Babylonia had reached at least the faint inkling of a view that the gods were actuated by justice and mercy, and that they could not condemn all alike to a fate so sad as eternal confinement in a dark cave. Besides *Aralû*, the abode of gloom, there was also, they came to believe, an 'Island of the Blest,' situated at the confluence of the streams to which those were carried who had won the favour of the gods. Ut-Napishtim, the Babylonian Noah, had won the favour of the gods. When the rest of mankind were destroyed in the Deluge, Ut-Napishtim and his wife were carried to this island by Ea, the god of humanity, and together continued there to lead a life not unlike that of the immortal gods.

These favourites of the gods, however, were excessively few. This is a great and unaccountable surprise. The kings of Babylonia were not sent to the 'Island of the Blest.' The priests themselves do not seem to have found their way thither. Like the kings and heroes of the Greek epic, they all pass together to the land of no return, to the dark and dismal dwelling far below the earth. An exception is not made even in the case of kings like Sargon, or Naram-Sin of Akkad, or Dungi of the Ur dynasty, although these kings have the sign for deity attached to their names and had temples dedicated in their honour just like the gods. Professor JASTROW thinks that the explanation of this may be that the divinity of the Babylonian kings was a political and not a religious prerogative. The head of the State was identified, as it were, with the tutelary god. As soon as he ceased to be head of the State the identification ceased; he became a mere man, and passed to where almost all mere men go.

There is one remarkable thing about the ideas which the Babylonians had regarding the state of the dead. Whether it was popular belief or priestly speculation, no ethical ingredient seems ever to have entered into it. Never once is it hinted in

the religious literature of Babylonia or Assyria that the life lived on earth had anything to do with the condition of the life after death. Never once is it suggested that the wicked will find a retribution or the good a reward. There is no figure in Babylonian or Assyrian religion like the Osiris of the Egyptian religion, that judge of the dead who weighs the good deeds against the bad in order to decide the destiny of the soul. While a man is alive he is expected to do everything in his power by confession of sin and by elaborate expiatory rite to secure the favour of the gods or appease their anger. But all his hopes are centred upon earthly happiness and present success. The gods have an interest in the living; with the dead they have no concern.

And so we find that if, once in a way, a man or woman is carried after death to the 'Island of the Blest,' it is not on the ground of character or conduct. In the Bible we find Noah, like Job, spoken of as perfect and righteous, and that is the explanation of his escape from the Flood. But in Babylonian literature no such encomium is passed on Ut-Napishtim, of whom the utmost that is said is that he was 'a very clever one.'

Is this not the essential difference between the religion of Babylonia and the religion of Israel? Professor JASTROW thinks it is. 'Had an ethical factor been introduced, in however faint a degree, we should have found,' he says, 'a decided modification of the primitive views in regard to the fate of the dead. Perhaps there might have been a development not unlike that which took place among the Hebrews, who, starting from the same point as the Babylonians and Assyrians, reached the conclusion that a god of justice and mercy extended his protection to the dead as well as to the living, and that those who suffered injustice in this world would find a compensatory reward in the next.'

Dr. Edward Carus SELWYN, the author of *St. Luke the Prophet* and other books like it, has



published yet another and a larger volume, to which he has given the title of *The Oracles in the New Testament* (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net).

It is a book of incessant provocation. We do not mean that it always provokes unto love and to good works; but it always provokes to thinking. There is perhaps not one single page of the book with which the student of the Gospels will be wholly in agreement. But there must be very few pages that do not make him stop to think again.

For example. Dr. SELWYN is discussing the date of Christ's birth. Following St. Luke, he maintains that the Nativity took place at the time when Quirinius was *legatus* of Syria, in 6 A.D. There is nothing, he says, in Luke which conflicts with this statement. But what, then, will he do with Lk 3<sup>23</sup>?

Take the reading of that verse according to WESTCOTT and HORT: 'And Jesus himself when he began was about thirty years of age, being the son, as was supposed, of Joseph.' What is the meaning of 'when he began'? The Revisers say the meaning is, when He began to teach. But that is a mere supposition; and it is scarcely possible, if that had been the meaning, that the words 'to teach' would have been omitted. Dr. SELWYN follows BLASS.

Now BLASS is not satisfied with 'when he began to teach,' and he is not satisfied with 'when he began.' 'When he began,' he says, is unintelligible. Following CLEMENT he changes one letter of one word (*ἀρχόμενος* into *ἐρχόμενος*), and then he gets the translation 'coming' in place of 'when he began.' But coming to what? Coming to the Baptism, says CLEMENT. This is CLEMENT's supposition. And it is just as difficult to believe that 'coming' could be written for 'coming to the Baptism,' as that 'when he began' could be written for 'when he began to teach.'

Let us keep to 'coming.' It might be rendered 'he that cometh.' Now 'he that cometh' is a prophetic term of the Messiah. There is no article with it, just as there is no article with the word for Messiah (*χριστός*) itself. Luke was fully aware of it as a technical term. It is part of the question which the Baptist sent his disciples to put to Jesus; and it is found in the Hosanna cry: 'Blessed is he that cometh.'

Whereupon we read the verse: 'Now Jesus himself was the coming one'—and the difficulty about the chronology disappears.

'If thou wilt thou canst.' These are the two attributes of God which seem to the popular mind to be for ever in conflict. At the present time it is His power that is in doubt. We have had the Divine Fatherhood so often and so eloquently recommended to us; we have so often been told that 'like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth'—not them that fear Him only, but all mankind, that we have come to believe that God is a God of good intention. But what is to be said of the pain and the poverty that are in the world? We read that it is not the will of our Father which is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish. We come to the conclusion that His will is good but He has not the power to make it prevail.

Some time ago, say about the time of the Reformation, it was all the other way. God was a potter; men were the clay in His hands. He had issued His decrees and was daily executing them in the works of creation and providence. The familiar texts were taken from the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans: 'For the scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might shew my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth. Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth. Thou wilt say then



unto me, Why doth he yet find fault? For who hath resisted his will? Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?’

---

Go back another step. In the days of our Lord the will and the power of God were in harmony. What He desired to do that He did. But it was a disastrous harmony. For all the acts of God’s providence were directed for the benefit of those in whom He was well pleased. And He was well pleased with that select number only who knew the Law and kept it. The rest—and they were almost the whole race of mankind—were outside His concern and apart from His care. ‘This people who knoweth not the law are cursed.’

---

Jesus broke that harmony. He did not deny that the will and the work of God go together, but He compelled men to consider them separately. He stood for God. He deliberately stood to them in God’s stead. When they thought of God, He demanded that they should think of Him. When they saw Him, He was surprised if they did not see God. Now as He stood there, to all appearance a man among men, it was inevitable that they should make up their minds about His attributes separately.

---

And it is no surprise to find that they first made up their minds about His power. ‘If thou wilt thou canst.’ For the evidence of His power was every day around them, and He daily drew attention to it. He insisted upon their noticing it. ‘That the Son of man hath power on earth’—He thereupon cured the man of his paralysis. He even made it the final and sufficient test of faith. ‘Believe ye that I am able to do this?’

---

For no one who acknowledged the power of God in Christ would be long in acknowledging His goodwill. ‘If thou wilt thou canst.’ The

answer came immediately: ‘I will.’ And not in word only but in deed. So it was always. His daily life declared His own goodwill. He went about doing good. And so it may be said that the moment they recognized in Him the mighty power of God, that moment they knew as never before how gracious God is.

---

Thus to those who believed, the harmony between the attributes of God, which Christ seemed at first to destroy, was restored. And the sinner was subject of it quite as much as the saint. What consternation He must have caused among the righteous when He said, ‘This man’—this publican and sinner—‘went down to his house justified rather than the other’—more just in the sight of God than the just man. This outcast of God went down to his house more under the favour of God than the erstwhile exclusive favourite.

---

Now return for a moment to the beginning. In our own day we believe in God’s goodwill, but we do not believe in His power. What do we think prevents Him from working out His will? There are two answers, the one scientific, the other philosophical.

---

The scientific answer is, the nature of things. The student of science does not deny the existence of God. Or, if he does, in doing so he is not a student of science. And he does not deny His benevolence. But he says that, however benevolent God may be, He is continually prevented from translating His benevolence into beneficence. He points to the struggle for existence up and down the whole scale of life. And the conclusion he comes to is that there is a nature of things that is more than God. And if it is urged that God must Himself be the author of this nature of things, he replies that then God must have found it impossible to make the world without curtailing His own omnipotence.

---

The answer to the man of science is, that all questions of what God might have done are philo-



sophical and not scientific questions. As a man of science he has therefore nothing to do with them. Let him attend to the nature of things. That is matter of observation and legitimate inference. Does the struggle for existence defy God's power?

---

What answer can we give? The answer is the acknowledgment of God in Christ. For the moment that a man recognizes God in Christ he sees, first of all, and sees clearly, that God is no respecter of persons. He sees, in the next place, that it is not the will of God that any man, woman, or child, or living creature upon earth should suffer pain or pass through sorrow. But he sees also, and this is the point, that whatever suffering there may be in the world God's goodwill is not defied; it is only delayed. There are degrees of good. And he sees that the lesser good, which is freedom from pain, is delayed only that the higher good, which is freedom from sin, may be accomplished.

---

The philosophical dilemma is different. God cannot always carry out His will, says the philosopher, because there is a will that is superior to His. That will is Fate.

---

Now there is a certain fascination in the idea of a will impersonal, impalpable, but also implacable, above the will even of the Almighty. It may not differ much, as it finds its place in the mind of man, from the scientific conception of the nature of things. But in its origin it is wholly different. It is an inheritance from the Greeks.

---

And yet the Greeks did not believe in it. It is a marvellous thing that after all our study of the Greek religion, after all that we have been taught so confidently about those half-personal beings, the Furies and the Fates, about that altogether

impersonal but much more awful being, Fate itself, it is a marvellous thing, we say, to find that the greatest scholar of the religion of Greece, should come forward now to tell us that it is all a mistake. Dr. L. R. FARNELL, the author of *The Cults of the Greek States*, has just issued a book to which he has given the title of *Greece and Babylon* (T. & T. Clark; 7s. 6d.). It is a handsome octavo volume and very pleasant to read. Dr. FARNELL himself speaks of it as a comparative sketch of Mesopotamian, Anatolian, and Hellenic religions. Now in one of the chapters of this book he tells us what is known and may be relied upon as to the conception of God's power entertained by these peoples. And he says that neither Babylonians nor Greeks, in their uncontaminated days, ever believed in a Fate that was higher than the highest God.

---

They believed in Furies, they believed in Fates, but they were all in the hollow of God's hand. In Fate they did not believe. These are Dr. FARNELL'S words: 'It has often been popularly and lightly maintained that the Hellenic deities were subordinate to a power called Fate. This is a shallow misjudgment, based on a misinterpretation of a few phrases in Homer; we may be certain that the aboriginal Hellene was incapable of so gloomy an abstraction, which would sap the vitality of personal polytheism and which only appears in strength in the later periods of religious decay.'

---

So then, the belief in a Fate to which God Himself must bow is a purely philosophical conception, and as such the religious man has no concern with it. It is a hypothesis which he does not need, a hypothesis which no man needs; and it explains nothing. The moment that a man says, 'God be merciful,' he sees that with God all things are possible.



## The Message of Rudolf Eucken.

BY THE REV. J. DICK FLEMING, D.D., PROFESSOR OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY, AND LECTURER  
IN PHILOSOPHY, MANITOBA COLLEGE, WINNIPEG.

APART from his originality and vigour of thought, Eucken must be regarded as a prophet among the philosophers, with a definite and serious message for all men, and particularly for all whose function it is to teach and guide their fellows.

The chief works of the philosopher of Jena may be mentioned, first of all. They are as follows—*The Problem of Human Life, as viewed by the Great Thinkers from Plato to the Present Day* (1889)—a work of profound insight, in which, relating each master of thought to the life and conditions of his time, he seeks to reveal in each some aspect of the substantial truth; *The Truth of Religion* (1901), where he shows what religion stands for, and particularly what is the essential content of truth in Christianity; *The Currents of Present-day Thought* (1904, 3rd ed.); and finally *The Main Outlines of a New View of Life* (1907). Of these works three have been translated (the last under the title *Life's Basis and Life's Ideal*, A. & C. Black, 1911), as well as several smaller treatises (e.g. *The Life of the Spirit* in the 'Crown Theological Library,' and *Christianity and the New Idealism* in Harper's Library). What facilitates the understanding of Eucken's philosophy is that, whether dealing with the history of past thought, or criticising present-day tendencies, or considering the problem of religion, he is always expounding the same central message—that all thought worthy of the name is an attempt to give expression to the life of the spirit which is in man, and yet higher than man.

It will help to clear the way for the understanding of Eucken's positive idealism if we start with his review of present-day thought and life, and his criticism of the various forms of modern culture. No one who has his eyes open to the variety of life around him will fail to notice how discordant are the voices in which men of to-day are uttering the views of the world and their practical ideals. These dissonant voices constitute a challenge to the reflective mind, indicating the crisis in which we stand and the need of some deeper solution of life's problems than has yet been reached. Eucken distinguishes five different types of mental and

practical attitude, each of which is adopted by good men, and therefore needs more than a negative criticism. Of these five attitudes, two may be described as older views which, though still maintaining themselves, are being gradually pressed into the background, while the remaining three are modern and enjoy the greatest popularity and influence. The older two are the views and ideals presented on the one hand by the ordinary religious man, and on the other by the idealist philosopher. The three more modern attitudes that largely hold the field are seen in the naturalistic, the socialist, and the æsthetic individualist types of mind.

### FIVE TYPES OF MIND.

1. The first is the attitude of the ordinary religious man, who accepts the traditional faith of Christianity, and looks back for inspiration to the new life that came into the world in Jesus Christ. Coming to manhood in a decadent era, weary of life and despairing of any solution of the world-problems, Christianity presented itself as a refuge from evil, a religion of redemption. It taught men to surmount life's evil by lifting their thought and aspiration above the earthly existence to a supernatural life, a kingdom of God, which, invisible in its essence, becomes visible in the Church. It called men to a new world-transcending life, inviting them to find peace and blessedness in a home of the spirit far beyond the disturbing influence of the world's sin and sorrow. Christianity was, however, no onesidedly transcendent system, like that of Plotinus the neo-Platonist, or of the Indian religion, calling to a total disparagement of the earthly life and all its interests. It did not teach a mere renunciation of the world; rather it called men through the conversion of heart and life to a definite transformation of the world. History shows that Christianity has largely effected what it proclaimed and sought. It has created a new world within the old; it has exalted men to a new spiritual plane, and placed itself the mightiest force in human life. Yet we cannot be blind to the fact that from the seventeenth century onward there has



appeared a growing opposition to this type of life, not merely on the part of individuals, but of large masses of men in all the communities of Europe. We can see on what this opposition is based; and we can see how far it extends, that the opposition is not to some forms of Christianity, but to Christianity root and branch.

For one thing, modern science has tended to the dissolution of the old religious beliefs. It has done away with the old geocentric and anthropocentric point of view: the earth is no longer the centre of the universe, nor will science admit a supernatural anthropomorphic power, interfering with the order of nature.

But, further, the modern man attaches little meaning to the call to renounce the world. Such an appeal might be applicable to the earlier ages of Christendom when men were world-weary and glad to abandon all earthly interests. But to-day these interests have broadened and deepened; science and art, business and statecraft call forth man's highest powers, and elicit an intense interest in the immediately present. There is now a keen and wholesome affirmation of life, an uplifting joy in contending with nature's powers and secrets, and wresting these to human uses. And to those who throw themselves with zest into such interests, the religious point of view seems tame and ineffective, its appeal to other-worldliness meaningless, its save-your-soul attitude narrow and paltry. Even with those who still cling to the old religious faith, there is no longer the old strong and assured confidence; and faith, instead of being the triumphant support and inspiration of life, has itself to be earnestly upheld and battled for. And strive as we will, we cannot return to the old certitude. Our modern habits of critical reflexion have simply destroyed the immediate faith and axiomatic certainty of former days. Many of the 'fundamental truths' of Christianity are strict matters of history; and criticism has made it more and more impossible to accept without question any authoritative historical tradition.

Now we may debate the question whether these grounds of opposition are justified, and how far they touch the substantial truth of religion; but it is surely too late in the day to decry this growing movement of opposition as a mere upheaval of Satanic powers. Rather it should be clear to us that new spiritual forces are here at work, which make a justifiable demand; and that if Christianity

is to retain or to regain its power some radical reconstruction will be necessary. In the meantime it must be evident that the religious standpoint has been increasingly set aside.

2. The second type of mind is that represented in the standpoint of immanent idealism. In some forms idealism stands aloof from Christianity, in others it stands incorporated with it, and in others again it is unconsciously substituted for it. It has this, at least, in common with the religious type of mind, that the central reality and the central interest of life are found not in the sense-world, but in an invisible spiritual thought-world. But with the idealist the element of negation, which is so prominent and essential a factor in religion, is toned down or set aside. The spiritual and the natural are scarcely separated; they are but two sides of the same truth—the one the inner reality, the other the outer manifestation. For the idealist God is not the world-superior of Hebrew and Christian faith, but the world-pervading force, the spiritual unity of the whole; and the aim of life is to reach below the surface of the world to the unseen spiritual reality which it veils and yet manifests. The true good of life is not the merely useful, is not to be measured by the surface or material value; it is essentially a spiritual good, in which the particular and individual will is subordinated to the universal will or universal self which is one with the deeper law of the universe.

This type of life may be traced back to the Platonic philosophy, and has close analogy with certain aspects of Christianity; but it has reached its full development in modern times, among the cultured adherents of the idealistic philosophy.

Now doubtless much has been achieved from this standpoint. It has made possible large and comprehensive and genial views of life, and without deprecating the spiritual it has yielded—what the modern mind insists on—a due appreciation of the natural side of life, a strong affirmation of life's present values. Yet this idealism, like the religious type of mind, has recently suffered an eclipse; the only question is why it has given place to what are apparently less elevated altitudes. The reason is that this modern idealism, with its joyous affirmation of life and its optimistic view of the rationality of the universe, can appeal only to the cultured and favoured few. In a great formative period of activity, and among those who were engaged in creating new worlds of thought, the



idealist contentment with the universe as it stands was not impossible. But men of ordinary cast of mind, who stand close to the hard facts of life, are not likely to be satisfied with any easy optimism offered in the name of philosophy. Is nature, then, really a manifestation of spirit? Is it not often quite obviously indifferent to the spiritual ends? Does not actual life teem with facts that stubbornly resist all idealizing processes?

For many to-day idealism is only a sort of half-way house between the older religious standpoint and the frankly irreligious view of the present age with its interest in immediate existence. What indeed, is the Immanuel God of idealism but a vague abstraction; what but the ghost of the older personal God of religious worship? If we abandon the reality, why retain faith in the shadow?

3. From these older conceptions and modes of life the modern mind is turning away dissatisfied; and instead of old mythologies and vague idealisms is finding a centre of interest in life's realities—either in nature, or in social life, or in the satisfaction of his individual personality. The first of these modern types is seen in the naturalist or materialist scheme of life, where the point of departure is nature, with its mechanism of laws, in the knowledge and use of which man's happiness is conceived to depend. Human life is conceived as a simple development of nature; and its spiritual elements are a mere by-product of the material. Science is purely a matter of experience, reflecting the order of sensible impressions. God, Freedom, Immortality belong to the realm of old-fashioned dreams, scarcely pardonable in the clear light of modern science. Man's ideal is simply to acquire and use what is of material value, to know and conform himself to his environment; for only so is happiness attainable.

This naturalistic temper of mind has passed far beyond the limits of the scientific world; it represents the practical attitude of great masses of men to-day, who have turned dissatisfied from the illusions of religion and philosophy to the immediate material realities. There is in this temper of mind an honesty of criticism, and an aspiration after reality, which claim to be respected.

Yet men will not find permanent satisfaction in this substitute for the older ideals. Indeed, were the underlying conception, which reduces the

spiritual to the natural, consistently carried out, it would lead not merely to the destruction of the moral and religious life, but to the destruction of science itself. It is obvious to all that if man is merely a part of nature, subject entirely to nature's law, fighting for existence like all other animals, then the higher moral life, the realities of love, self-sacrificing friendship, devotion to ends beyond ourselves, must be radically reinterpreted, or dismissed entirely as illusions. But it is also true that from this standpoint, logically adhered to, science itself is an illusion. For if reality lies only in the passing impressions of our sensible nature, the claim of science to discover permanently valid truth must be wholly illusory. The last word of naturalism must be Humism, the denial of the possibility of knowledge.

Science itself implies more than nature. It is no mere copying of sensible impressions; it is at least a combining, a unifying of experience, and that involves a mind that is something more than a 'bundle of sensations.' Not only religion, then, with its kingdom of God: not only morality with its high activities of honesty, love, sacrifice, and devotion to work: not only art with its striving to pass through the thing of sense to the ideal beyond it; but science itself with its organizing of natural fact—all alike prove that man in some sense stands apart from nature and is higher than nature. All these human activities in the invisible world of spirit will render for ever futile any attempt to reduce the spiritual to the natural, to make truth and beauty and goodness mere by-products or outgrowths of nature.

4. Another type of the modern mind is seen in the socialist attitude, where the social relationship is taken as the ground-fact of human life. The individual is explained by social facts, such as heredity, education, environment, so that guilt or responsibility, instead of being individual matters, are laid rather at the door of society. Hence tolerant judgment passed on individual wrongdoing; hence, too, the remarkable extension of the sentiment of solidarity. The all-pervading ideal here is the happiness of the greatest number, consisting in the proper distribution of the utilities that serve mankind; and prevailing evils and inequalities are conceived as finding their only possible remedy in some reorganization of society. Eucken cordially admits that there often works in this temper of mind a large-hearted utilitarianism,



which labours to soften the severities of justice, to protect the weak against the lawless strong, and to throw open the door of opportunity to all. Yet the exclusive utilitarian position cannot but tend to lower the moral ideal to considerations of physical preservation and material good.

Certain it is that the exaggerated emphasis on the social aspect of life fails to do justice to the independence of the individual, and to the value of the individual ideals even as measured by the social standard. Is it true that society and the social motives are the real roots of progress? Has not all notable advance in any sphere—moral, social, scientific, religious—been due to the labour of individuals who rose above the social conditions and at times defied society? Or could science accomplish what it has done, were it only motivated by what is useful for society? Could the socialist himself work so disinterestedly for the common good, unless he recognized unconsciously the worth of a life of disinterestedness and self-sacrifice—things that cannot be measured by any utilitarian standard?

5. In fact, we have another type of life to-day, which emphasizes the independent value of the individual with as much insistence as the other does the importance of society. This type is that of the individualist—Eucken gives Nietzsche as a prominent example—whose main thought is to be free from all conventions, to develop himself by the unhampered expansion of his life in all directions, and to taste the sweetness of life in all its range of possibility. From this standpoint the life of sense and the life of spirit are equally valuable, and the individualist seeks to taste the pleasures of both, unhampered by old-fashioned scruples or social rules. While this type also has its measure of truth, it gives little promise for the future. Apart from the obvious charge of egoism, it may be questioned whether the individualist ever really attains what he seeks. Freedom and power are noble ideals. But is freedom found by obeying one's own changing moods and by flouting conventions. Is not the man who pursues such a path rather the slave of the moment, a reed shaken in the wind? And is power really found by the man who narrows his interest within himself, and so becomes incapable of genuine devotion to work, or of sacrifice and self-forgetting love—which are assuredly the greatest sources of power in the world?

### THE SPIRITUAL LIFE.

Now all these types of life are prominently represented to-day, and, with whatever variations, they serve comprehensively to describe the present situation. The older ideals are decaying, and one-sided naturalism, one-sided socialism, or an Epicurean individualism is occupying the ground. The present-day culture has turned away from the infinite ideal to the worship of 'realities,' *i.e.* to the realities of the immediate present. Everywhere the trend of life is from the invisible to the visible, from the spiritual to the natural, from vague eternal futurities to the immediate and certain present. And, no doubt, under this banner of realistic culture progress has been made—progress in science and invention, in technical and historical knowledge, in social organization—all leading to a life that is superficially larger; but the deeper things of the spirit remain in the background. We are outwardly rich, and inwardly poor: rich at the circumference of life, empty and poor at the centre. We sometimes hide our poverty by a hesitating return to this or that tradition that was born of high spiritual ideals. Thus 'we proclaim in our religion the confessions and feelings of by-gone times as our own convictions: we build our domes in styles that express a different spiritual environment; we depend in our philosophy on systems and problems of other times; in all we are lacking in the truth of life.' In short, we have been gaining the world and losing our soul. And the crisis of the situation will appear all the more acute if we consider that the social unrest, the strong and passionate desire of the masses to share to the full in the world's happiness, comes at a time when the old foundations are being swept away, and the aim of life is directed to the present and merely human to the neglect of the deeper spiritual values. An idealism no longer certain of itself, fighting against a positivism that cannot satisfy; an individualism idolizing self-power and unrestrained license; a vast social movement that sees only material good,—if mankind pursue this path, what can we expect but the destruction of the spiritual life?

This crisis constitutes a challenge to those who represent the nobler guiding forces of society; a challenge not to be met by a timid return to old tradition or by inventing some new and extravagant scheme, but by a real and positive reconstruction



in which the substantial truth of the old will be conserved, and the truth in which the modern mind insists is also fully assimilated. A new and broader theory of the universe? No; but something more substantial in the first place. What is needed, and what is actually beginning to show itself beneath all the soulless culture of to-day, is a new movement of the spiritual life towards the discovery and appreciation of itself on the deepest reality. This deeper life-movement, which the philosopher can only interpret and bring to clear consciousness, may be seen even in the varied movements we have described, shallow and soulless as they appear. It is seen in the materialist's devotion to his science, which is in direct contradiction to his materialism, for it shows that in his claim to survey and eliminate nature, he himself stands spiritually above nature. It is seen in the socialist's devotion and self-sacrifice, which directly contradict the end of material happiness he professes, and show that for him the spiritual good is higher than the material. It is seen even in the individualist's demand of freedom and his claim to be allowed to make the best of his life—though he has not yet discovered where true freedom and self-development lie. In short, wherever you find unselfish devotion, genuine

sympathy, self-forgetting love, even interest in work for the work's sake, there you find a reality that is above nature with its individual strivings. The spiritual life has thus some foothold still; indeed, it can never die, or be permanently ignored. As yet, however, this deeper world of the spirit has not been understood at its true value. We think of it as an ideal that is as a shadowy realm, and quite secondary to the reality of nature. What we need then, in order to press forward with a clear consciousness of our aims and to unite the forces of modern life in substantial progress, is a new metaphysic, or, shall we say, a new appreciation of the spiritual life in us, as the deepest reality in our experience. As against the realism of to-day, which places the centre of truth in material things, we have to rise to a new realism of the spiritual life, as a movement not growing out of the merely natural, but striking its roots deeper into the whole of reality. The only satisfactory key to all our experience is that there is an independent spiritual life, not a product of the individual man with his natural likes and dislikes, but communicating itself to him, and exalting him above nature and revealing itself on the deeper reality of the universe.

(To be concluded.)

## The Great Text Commentary.

### THE GREAT TEXTS OF ROMANS.

#### ROMANS XV. 4.

‘For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that through patience and through comfort of the scriptures we might have hope.’—R.V.

ST. PAUL here states a great principle. It is the principle that the Old Testament was throughout designed for the instruction and establishment of New Testament believers. That is to say, the true ‘Author behind the authors’ of that mysterious Book watched, guided, effected its construction, from end to end, with the purpose full in His view of instructing for all time the developed Church of Christ. We have here a principle to guide us in the study of the Scriptures, both of the Old and of the New Testament. Their main use lies in their power so to teach as to

develop character in us. ‘Whatsoever things were written aforetime,’ that is to say, the whole of the Jewish Scriptures, including the Histories, the Psalms, the Prophecies (however they may have originated, and by whatsoever channel they may have come down to us), have now this definite purpose to fulfil, this practical end to serve, that they contribute to our learning. They exist for the information of the present, and for the education of future ages.

I have purposely refrained from reading *Lux Mundi*, but I am quite sure that our Christian faith ought not to be perilled on any predetermined view of what the history and character of the documents contained in the O.T. must be. What we are bound to hold is that the O.T., substantially as we receive it, is the Divine record of the discipline of Israel. This it remains, whatever criticism may determine or leave undetermined as to constituent parts. No one now,



I suppose, holds that the first three chapters of Genesis, for example, give a literal history—I could never understand how any one reading them with open eyes could think they did—yet they disclose to us a gospel. So it is probably elsewhere. Are we not going through a trial in regard to the use of popular language on literary subjects like that through which we went, not without sad losses, in regard to the use of popular language on physical subjects? If you feel now that it was, to speak humanly, necessary that the Lord should speak of the ‘sun rising,’ it was no less necessary that He should use the names ‘Moses’ and ‘David’ as His contemporaries used them. There was no critical question at issue. (Poetry is, I think, a thousand times more true than History; this is a private parenthesis for myself alone.)<sup>1</sup>

## I.

## WHAT WE ARE TO LEARN IN THE SCRIPTURES.

There are many kinds of learning to be got out of the Bible. It is a great manual of Eastern antiquities; it gives us information about the ancient world which we can obtain nowhere else. It carries us back to the early dawn of history, when as yet all we commonly mean by civilization did not exist. Again, it is a handbook of political experience. It shows us what a nation can do, and may have to suffer; how it may be affected by the conduct of its rulers; how it may make its rulers to be like itself. So again, it is a rich collection of the wisdom which should govern personal conduct; a man need not believe in Revelation in order to admire the shrewdness and penetration of the Book of Proverbs. Again, it is a mine of poetry; it contains the very highest poetry which the human race possesses; poetry before which the great masters of song—Homer, Dante, Shakespeare—must bow; poetry by which the two last have been, in fact, themselves largely inspired. Once more, it is a choice field for the study of language; in its pages we follow one language, the Hebrew, from its cradle to its grave; and it gives us lessons in the art of making language describe the emotions and moods of the soul which are not to be found elsewhere. But a man may be a good antiquarian, historian, economist, linguist, moralist; he may take the keenest interest in Scripture because it has so much to say on each and all of these subjects; and yet he may be entirely ignorant of the true teaching of Scripture. He may read the Bible, just as some people come to Church, only to admire the architecture or the music, thus missing the very end

<sup>1</sup> Westcott, *Life and Letters*, ii. 68.

which these beautiful and useful accessories of worship are intended to promote—the communion of the soul with God. Language, history, poetry, antiquities—these are not the subjects which the Bible was intended to teach us, interesting and valuable as they are in their way; they are taught in other books, ancient and modern, and by human teachers. The Bible must do something more for us than this, if it is to claim its title of the Book of God.

The Bible contains every type of true and valuable religious literature that is to be found in non-Christian sacred books, from the products of high psychic excitation to those of devout reflexion and ratiocination: prose and poetry, vision and chronicle, mystic flights and apophthegms of shrewd practical wisdom, religious out-pourings and ethical precepts. What we admire in the Vedas, in the Zend-Avesta, in the works of Lao-tsze, Confucius, and Mencius, in the sublime precepts of Gautama-Buddha, in the splendid zeal of Mohammed—all is there, and far more besides. There is a theology latent in the Bible that will never become obsolete; there is a human life depicted there which will supply inexhaustible ideals for men of every race and generation; there is a regenerating power in the sacramental truths enunciated there that none of the other ‘Bibles’ can point to. By the side of the revelations embodied in the Christian Scriptures the sacred books of China show themselves not religion at all, but mere philosophy; Buddhism is but negative; Islam, with its remote, despotic God, is void of all message of redeeming love.<sup>1</sup>

We search the world for truth; we cull  
The good, the pure, the beautiful  
From graven stone and written scroll,  
From all old flower-fields of the soul;  
And, weary seekers of the best,  
We come back laden from our quest,  
To find that all the sages said  
Is in the Book our mothers read,  
And all our treasure of old thought  
In His harmonious fulness wrought,  
Who gathers in one sheaf complete  
The scattered blades of God's sown wheat,  
The common growth that maketh good  
His all-embracing Fatherhood.<sup>2</sup>

The text lays down very clearly the belief in the abiding value of the Old Testament which underlies St. Paul's use of it. The Scriptures are to be read for our moral instruction, ‘for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness’; for the perfection of the Christian character, ‘that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work.’ St. Paul claims for the Old Testament these two things: (1) it teaches us great moral and spiritual truths; and (2) it witnesses to Christ.

<sup>1</sup> L. Ragg, *The Book of Books*, 281. <sup>2</sup> Whittier.



1. *The whole Old Testament was written to teach us great moral and spiritual truths,* and therefore it has an abiding practical value for faith and life. It is refreshing to recall St. Paul's claim, when we have been harried by the worries of criticism, with the wrangles over Old Testament records. After all, let the dates and the authors be what and who they may, let the process by which the materials came together be long or short, simple or complicated, discoverable or undiscoverable, there at last the record stands, there at last the Book lies open before us, and the clear purpose which has brought it together is as manifest and certain as ever. It is the record of the spiritual experiences of a race, experiences unique and prolonged, and manifold and momentous, experiences which embody and disclose the ways by which God has worked in the world, the methods by which He has drawn men near to Him, the discipline under which He has trained and purged and uplifted them. Through varied periods, under infinite variety of circumstance, still He pursued His design with them, till they came to a clearer understanding of that mind. Over two thousand years of historical development carried on the continuous tale, and now, collected, sifted, amalgamated, there the entire story lies. Unknown hands, it is true, have worked at it, unremembered lives have uttered themselves through it, but all witness to the will, the character, the intention with which God Almighty deals with men's souls and bodies; and since He is the Eternal God who changeth not, it reveals for all time and to all people what is His perpetual mode of treatment, His rule of conduct, His moral characteristics, His Fatherly handling, His way of bringing out judgment into victory. Therefore all these things are significant for us to-day, they reveal how that eternal God will prove Himself to be the same to us as to men of old time who served and trusted Him then.

2. *The Old Testament witnesses to Christ.* It is not only a bead-roll of faith, not only a record of heroic testimony, a treasure of splendid experience, but it is also a unity, a single Book, a single, supreme, consistent, continuous action. From end to end it says one thing and one only; it recalls one single event. By St. Paul's own special title it is called the mystery, the open secret, the Divine act of revelation, the thing that God was always

doing under cover as hidden heaven, yet preparing to be disclosed—the thing that was prepared from the foundation of the world, and that was at last done at the one fit moment, at the time and at the spot made ready according to the end decreed—the Mystery, Jesus Christ, the Hope of Glory. From cover to cover the Book is full of Him, and of Him only, one mind felt in it everywhere, one spirit quickening it, one Face looking out. From cover to cover the Bible records but one fact; it is a body possessed by a single dominant soul, and the soul that possesses it is Jesus Christ. He is the Harmony into which all its voices blend. He throws this or that into the background. He brings other parts forward to the front; His character is the Bible's conscience. His life is the measure of its inspiration.

Grant me, Lord, in all my studies,  
Through all volumes roaming where I list,  
Whatsoever spacious distance  
Rise in ample grandeur through thought's mist,  
Whatsoever land I find me,  
That of right divine to claim for Christ.

Do men dare to call Thy Scripture—  
Mystic forest, unilluminated nook?  
If it be so, O my spirit!  
Then let Christ arise on thee, and look  
With the long lane of His sunlight  
Shall be cut the forest of His Book.

## II.

### HOW WE ARE TO LEARN.

*'Through patience and through comfort of the scriptures.'*

No one can take account of the wide world darkened for the most part by gross idolatry, so that a fraction only of mankind even now know the name of the one God: no one can look out upon Christendom, desolated by war, and degraded by sin: no one can ponder the differences by which the foremost champions of right and purity and love are separated, without being at first filled with doubt and dismay. Can this, we ask, be the issue of the gospel, this partial spread, this imperfect acceptance, this discordant interpretation of the truth? When we are thus cast down, the Scriptures bring us comfort. By the long annals of the Divine history of mankind—so long that we can hardly go back in imagination to the earliest forms of religious life which they record—we are taught to see the slowness



of God's working, the patience with which He accepts what man in his weakness can offer, the variety of service which He guides to one end; and hope is again kindled.

Nature illustrates the lesson of the Bible. No result has been established more certainly by recent investigations than the gradual passage from lower to higher types of life in the natural world through enormous intervals of time. So far from this being opposed to revelation, as some have rashly argued, it falls in exactly with what the Bible teaches us of the spiritual progress of men. Why there should be this marvellous slowness in either case we cannot tell. It is enough for us to know that in this respect the whole Divine plan goes forward to our eyes in the same way. And if cycles of being came into existence and perished, if continents were washed away and re-formed before the earth was made fit for the habitation of man, we shall not wonder that it was by little and little that he was himself enabled to apprehend his relation to God, and through God to his fellows and to the world. And following the same guidance we shall be contented to wait while this knowledge which has been given to us spreads on all sides from scattered centres of light. Such has been the law from the first. We who see but little, and that little for a short time, would perhaps gladly have had it otherwise; but as we trust the Bible we can hope with full assurance, looking with patience to that end towards which all creation is moving, however slowly.<sup>1</sup>

E. von Dobschütz, writing on the 'Bible in the Church,' calls it 'the unparalleled religious guide-book.' He further asserts that 'an unusually favourable opportunity is afforded in the letters of Bismarck to his wife, from which we learn that the Bible was read daily by one of the greatest statesmen. . . . The chief enemy of the Bible is ignorance of it. Doubts and suspicions do not arise from Bible-reading, but they are communicated from outside to those who are not acquainted with the Bible. Of the whole book these people know only those passages which are attacked by the modern "Enlightenment." Consequently they hold it in contempt . . . as a hindrance to education and culture. Had they ever experienced any of the comfort and gladness which the pious reader can draw from its pages, they would be of a different opinion. The history of the Bible is an objective proof of its beneficent operation.'<sup>2</sup>

Charles Dickens, in a letter to his youngest son, when the boy was leaving home to join his brother in Australia, wrote: 'I put a New Testament among your books, for the very same reasons, and with the same hopes, that made me write an easy account of it for you when you were a little child. Because it is the best book that ever was . . . known in the world; and because it teaches you the best lessons by which any human creature who tries to be truthful and faithful to duty can possibly be guided. As your brothers have gone away, one by one, I have written to them such words as I am now writing to you, and have entreated them all to guide themselves by the Book.'

<sup>1</sup> Bishop Westcott.

<sup>2</sup> *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. ii., pp. 592, 607, 615.

1. *Through patience of the scriptures.*—This 'patience' is holy perseverance under trial, the patience which suffers and is strong, suffers and goes forward. Rich indeed are Pentateuch, and Prophets, and Hagiographa, both in commands to persevere and be of good courage, and in examples of men who were made brave and patient by the power of God in them, as they took Him at His word. And all this, says the Apostle, was on purpose, on God's purpose, that we also may learn to take Him at His word, to trust His plan concerning us.

When Robert Grosseteste was asked whence he had acquired his gentle, tactful, and courtly manners, the peasant's son, who had developed into the greatest man of his generation, is reported to have answered: 'It is true that I come of a humble father and mother, but from my earliest years I have studied the best men in the Scriptures, and have tried to conform my actions to theirs.'

2. *Through comfort of the scriptures.*—The word here used means more than 'consolation' though it includes consolation; it might be translated 'encouragement'; it means the voice of positive and enlivening appeal. The spirit of comfort is not so much that of a nurse as of an elder and braver comrade. The word in English is a strong word akin to fortitude, and the Greek original has a heartening, encouraging tone about it—the tone of a voice that calls to us like that of a friend, cheers us on, animates and invigorates us, as when the angel in Daniel's vision bids him not to fear, but to be strong. We call the Holy Spirit our Comforter; and although that is not an accurate rendering of the original word, which really means One who can be called to our side as a supporter, it does fairly represent, if we read it aright, the strengthening office of that Divine Friend beside us, whose presence at once commands and enables us to be strong and of a good courage. Comfort involves the renewal of energy, the recovery of lost or impaired force; it sets us on our feet again, it sends us back to our work with a fresh impulse: the very reason for which we are 'spoken to comfortably' is that we may rise up and go forth to meet the Lord, when He comes to us in all the might and love of the Ruler and the Shepherd.

Fancy a man thrown in upon himself, with no permitted music, nor relaxation, nor literature, nor secular conversation—nothing but his Bible, his own soul, and God's silence! What hearts of iron this system must have made. How different from our stuffed-arm-chair religion and a 'gospel



of comfort' ! as if to be made comfortable were the great end of religion.<sup>1</sup>

Charlotte Brontë, in a letter to Miss Ellen Nussey, written on February 20, 1837, confessed : 'Last Sunday I took up my Bible in a gloomy frame of mind ; I began to read ; a feeling stole over me such as I have not known for many long years—a sweet, placid sensation like those that I remember used to visit me when I was a little child. . . . I thought of my own Ellen—I wished she had been near me that I might have told her how happy I was, how bright and glorious the pages of God's holy word seemed to me.'<sup>2</sup>

### III.

#### THE REWARD OF LEARNING.

'That we might have hope.'

This is the promised reward of all our learning, 'the hope set before us.' The 'hope' spoken of here is the Christian hope, the hope of the glory of God ; and the Christian has it as he is able, through the help of God's word in the Scriptures, to maintain a brave and cheerful spirit amid all the sufferings and reproaches of life. For hope has been worthily called 'the energy and effort of faith' ; a 'real act of the will' and moral nature ; a refusal 'to be cowed and depressed by evil' ; unlike the mere buoyant exuberance of spirits which belongs to a sanguine disposition, too light-hearted to feel difficulties or understand perils,—it is such a gathering up of all the interior forces in deliberate reliance on God as can elevate, fortify, and inspire. We need it now, in days when some who pass for philosophers, but have given up the true 'wisdom,' preach a view of life which is hopeless and which, as it has been well said, can be met and overmatched only by the repression of atheism, whether professed or virtual. The question of hope for man is ultimately the question of a God for man, and indeed of man himself, as a moral and spiritual being.

1. *We find hope for ourselves*, in our present lives and in our final destiny. A man must have hope for himself first, if he is to have hope for others. If he wishes to have hope for the world, he must first have hope for himself, for he is in the world a part of it, and he must learn what blessings God intends for him, and they will teach him what blessings God has in store for the earth. Faith and hope, like charity, must begin at home.

<sup>1</sup> F. W. Robertson, *Life and Letters*, 211.

<sup>2</sup> Clement K. Shorter, *Charlotte Brontë and her Circle*, p. 213.

By learning the corruption of our own hearts we learn the corruption of human nature. By learning what is the only medicine which can cure our own sick hearts, we learn what is the only medicine which can cure human nature. We learn by our own experience, that God is all-forgiving love ; that His peace shines bright upon the soul which casts itself utterly on Jesus Christ the Lord for pardon, strength, and safety ; that God's Spirit is ready and able to raise us out of all our sin, and sottishness, and weakness, and wilfulness, and selfishness, and renew us into quite new men, different characters from what we used to be ; and so, by having hope for ourselves, we learn step by step and year by year to have hope for our friends, for our neighbours, and for the whole world.

Her languid pulses thrill with sudden hope,

That will not be forgot nor cast aside,

And life in statelier vistas seems to ope,

Illimitably lofty, long, and wide.

What doth she know? She is subdued and mild,

Quiet and docile 'as a weanèd child.'

If grief came in such unimagined wise,

How may joy dawn? In what undreamed-of hour

May the light break with splendour of surprise,

Disclosing all the mercy and the power?—

A baseless hope, yet vivid, keen, and bright,

As the wild lightning in the starless night.

She knows not whence it came, nor where it passed,

But it revealed, in one brief flash of flame,

A heaven so high, a world so rich and vast,

That, full of meek contrition and mute shame,

In patient silence hopefully withdrawn,

She bows her head, and bides the certain dawn.<sup>3</sup>

2. *We gain hope for the world.* It is a deadly thing when the Christian allows himself to lose hope, when he allows himself to think that all is lost. Position after position seems to be taken. People say : 'Look at the educated world, they have forsaken you ; they have taken your title-deeds, and found them to be faulty ; they have examined your dogmatic utterances and found them to be incredible ; they have taken the results on which you rely and have found other causes to account for them, with which religion has nothing to do. . . The educated world is against you, you are fighting for a lost cause if you hope to see the triumph of Christianity.' 'Your churches even are gone,' says the apostle of despair, 'you mourn in your sad penitential appeals for those who will not

<sup>3</sup> Emma Lazarus.



lament for sins in which they do not believe. You pipe in your solemn feasts to those who will not dance, and leave you clad in the robes of an æstheticism which has failed to attract, or decked with popular appeals which have failed to charm. Your very schools are gone,' continues our pitiless opponent; 'children are growing up who will revolt against the fetters which have kept their fathers in bondage too long.'

Yet, in spite of it all, Hope is still able to raise her voice, and also to make it heard, as it brings forward the encouragement, if it be but as a piece of floating seaweed, which tells us that the enterprise will yet be crowned with success. When the smoke of conflict rolls away, and there is a lull in the noise of battle, we see that we are not only in a position which is not hopeless, but in the midst of the orderly working of a well-recognized plan. If society has its sinners, society also has its saints. Those who know the inner life of the Church know its vigour and its triumphs; those who know her children know that Christ still takes them up in His arms and blesses them. If any one is tempted to despair let him follow the advice of St. Paul, let him consider the days of old and the years that are past, let him drink in patience and comfort from the Scriptures, for they will show him not only examples of those who waited for the Lord, and found His never-failing aid; but more than this, a plan which has never wavered, not even when all seemed to be lost, a plan which reached its crisis when those who waited for the consolation of Israel seemed to be only a handful of worn-out watchers. No purpose of God has failed, nothing once endued by Him with life will fail of some purpose in His Kingdom, stern though that purpose may become.

Both Testaments declare

(As here evinced) how blissful is their state,  
Ordained of God friendship with Him to share.

Isaiah says that in their native land

Each with a twofold vesture shall be dight;  
And by his words, this life I understand.

The same more clearly hath thy Brother shown,  
When, speaking of the garments pure and white,  
This revelation he to us makes known.<sup>1</sup>

3. *Our hope is fulfilled in Christ.* The hope of the gospel is a hope of God in our Saviour Jesus Christ. It rests upon God's eternal counsel, which He has been working out ever since the world began, and which we can spell out piece by piece in the records of His book. The coming judge is none other than the Saviour; neither will His judgment be any new thing. He is judging every one of us at every moment; severing the good from the bad in us, and burning our chaff with fire unquenchable. We shall be more entirely filled with that Divine hope the more we strive to bring the thought of our Saviour and Judge to bear upon all our present doings. And if sorrow or want or any other trial presses us down now, and seems to make hope almost an impossibility, let us remember that it is through the patience and the comfort of the Scriptures that we are led on to Hope.

I have found something in the sky and sea

Like to a mystic message partly heard,

That speaks to me when all my soul is stirred

By some far hope that lays its hands on me.

When for a wider scope my heart makes plea,

And frets at life like an imprisoned bird,

There comes from star and wave a soothing word—

The healing touch of earth's immensity.

As to our childhood's eyes all heaven lay

Just where the sea flowed through the Western gate.

So for our life-dimmed sight some larger fate

Gleams through the vista of the dying day:

It is God's word to us that soon or late,

Where the heart leads the feet shall find a way.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dante, *Paradiso*, xxv. 88-96 (tr. by Wright).

<sup>2</sup> Percy C. Ainsworth, *Poems and Sonnets*, 67.



## Harnack on 1 Corinthians xiii.

BY PRINCIPAL THE REV. J. G. TASKER, D.D., HANDSWORTH COLLEGE, BIRMINGHAM.

THE report of the proceedings (vol. vii., 1911) of the Royal Academy of Science (Prussia) contains an erudite paper<sup>1</sup> by Dr. Adolf Harnack on 'St. Paul's Hymn in Praise of Love.' It is a fresh and suggestive study of 1 Co 13, with special reference to its significance for the student of the history of religions. Its value is greatly increased by numerous elaborate and luminous notes. With the addition of these notes, the original essay has become a pamphlet of 32 quarto pages.<sup>2</sup>

The theme of the hymn is found in 1 Co 8<sup>1f.</sup>: 'Knowledge puffeth up, but love edifieth. . . . If any man loveth God, the same is known of him.' After digressions on other subjects, the Apostle returns to this theme as he is discoursing on spiritual gifts. Alike in its subject-matter and in its style, the hymn differs from the chapters between which it is found. To discover the connexion of thought, it is necessary to ascertain the meaning of 12<sup>31</sup>: 'But desire earnestly the greater gifts. And a still more excellent way shew I unto you.' What are we to understand by 'the greater gifts'? And how can the contents of the hymn be described as 'a way'?

By 'the greater gifts' Harnack understands the virtues which in Gal 5<sup>22</sup> St. Paul calls 'the fruit of the Spirit.' It is true that, in the narrower sense of the word, they are not 'gifts' (*χαρίσματα*); but of set purpose the Apostle writes paradoxically. Properly speaking, the 'gifts' mentioned in 12<sup>4-11</sup> are extraordinary (*Zugaben*), and the Corinthians are reminded that the greater gifts are those virtues which are essential elements in the Christian character. Harnack is aware that the majority of expositors understand by 'the greater gifts' those which are more profitable for edifying; but he is confident that the comparison is with all the gifts enumerated not only in 12<sup>29f.</sup>, but also in 12<sup>4ff.</sup>: 'It is quite arbitrary to make any limitation here.'

<sup>1</sup> *Das hohe Lied des Apostels Paulus von der Liebe (1 Kor. 13) und seine religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung.* Von Adolf Harnack. Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Sonderabdruck. Berlin: Georg Reimer.

<sup>2</sup> This paper, it should be said, is not printed in the two substantial volumes of Essays by Dr. Harnack, recently published under the title *Aus Wissenschaft und Leben*.

Harnack agrees with Godet and Meyer in preferring *κρείττονα*, 'better,' to *μείζονα*, 'greater.' It is probable, he thinks, that *κρείττονα* was the original reading in 12<sup>31</sup>, but that the text of this verse was assimilated to 13<sup>13</sup> and 14<sup>5</sup>, where *μείζονα* is rightly used in comparing gifts which belong to the same category. *μείζονα* is 'an almost exclusively Alexandrine reading.'

When in v.<sup>31b</sup> St. Paul says, 'And besides a super-excellent way shew I unto you,' Harnack holds that 'way' must be interpreted quite literally, and not metaphorically, as, e.g., 'doctrine.' The way in which St. Paul would have the Corinthians run zealously is 'love.' The negative and positive virtues enumerated in 13<sup>4-7</sup> are 'the better gifts,' and 'because love is their root, love is the means, as it is also the way, to their attainment.' In the Apostle's estimation, love is at once the best of the better gifts, and the way which leads to all the rest.

The 'Hymn' is divided into three parts, consisting respectively of vv.<sup>1-3.</sup> 4-7. 8-13. A detailed commentary is not attempted, but difficulties of interpretation are discussed at length. Occasionally, however, a welcome flashlight illumines a familiar passage, as when attention is called to the rhetorical effect of the repetition of the emphatic word 'all' in v.<sup>2</sup>, and to the contrast between what a man *has* and what he *is* in the climax of the same verse. 'It could not read, "I *have* nothing," for such a man has the most extraordinary gifts; but in the midst of these riches of knowledge *he is himself nothing*, that is to say, he is even poorer than poor.'

The longest investigation (seven pages) in the essay is devoted to an attempt to determine the true reading in v.<sup>3b</sup>. Did St. Paul write 'if I give my body *to be burned*' (*καυθήσομαι*), or 'if I give my body *that I may glory*' (*καυχήσομαι*)? On grounds of textual criticism alone, Harnack thinks that the question cannot be decisively answered. Indeed, the balance would incline towards *καυθήσομαι*, were it not that Origen, Clement of Alexandria, and Clement of Rome may be quoted in favour of *καυχήσομαι*. The scales are even, so far as external evidence is concerned. It remains to consider the internal evidence.



In favour of *καυθήσομαι*, commentators have urged that the supposition of a voluntary fiery death is especially appropriate when it is desired to cite an extreme example of self-sacrifice (cf. Dn 3<sup>28</sup>); that the reading is too difficult to have its origin in an emendation of the text; that, on the other hand, the change to *καυχῶμαι* is easily explicable, inasmuch as St. Paul frequently used the word; and that this reading is unsuitable to the context, and destroys the sense of the verse. In reply, Harnack says that the difficult reading is *καυθήσομαι*, as is proved by the varieties of interpretation: martyrdom by fire is not the sacrificing of self for others; many suggestions are improbable, as, e.g., fiery torture endured rather than make a confession to the disadvantage of others, or the branding of slaves; expositions which regard the phrase as having no special application fail to account for its presence; moreover, this general sense is more forcefully given without what ought to be the emphatic word: 'and if I give my body.' (For the absolute use of *παραδιδόναι*, cf. Ro 4<sup>25</sup>, and Plut. *Demet.* 49 f.) If Dn 3<sup>28</sup> is quoted, it must be remembered that a passage so well known might account for *καυθήσομαι* as a copyist's error, and certainly this change was more likely to be made than the reverse alteration after the era of martyrdom had begun. The awkwardness of the expression is hidden in the English translation, but it deserves consideration: 'The Greek language has no need to use such a circumlocution as "if I give my body so that I may be burned."'

It remains to meet the objection that the reading *καυχῶμαι* destroys the sense of the verse. Harnack confesses that this would be the case if 'glorying' meant 'empty boasting,' but the word has a far nobler significance. He complains that sufficient attention has not been paid to St. Paul's frequent assertion that the Christian may have a 'glorying' (*καύχημα*), which is the exact opposite of 'vainglory' (*κένοδοξία*). A word which is used fifty-five times by St. Paul must be interpreted 'psychologically,' that is to say, his use of it will reflect the characteristics of his mind. If he can write, 'We glory in our tribulations' (Ro 5<sup>2</sup>), why can he not say, 'We glory in giving our body'? The Apostle knew that there is a glorying which is 'not good' (1 Co 5<sup>6</sup>), but he also desired ground for glorying in the day of Christ (Ph 2<sup>16</sup>). There is a glorying which is seemly to the Christian, and it may furnish a worthy motive for self-sacrificing deeds. But even

the self-sacrifice contemplated will be counted 'nothing' without love. Love is essential to any glorying in the day of God.

If *καυχᾶσθαι* is the original reading, the change is accounted for by the fact that writers like Ignatius and Hermas do not use the word in a good sense. [Clement of Rome is an exception (*Ep. Cor.* xxxiv. 5), but Pauline influence is traceable in his Epistle (cf. 2 Co 7<sup>4</sup>.)] As signifying 'boasting,' it would be a stumbling-block; the change, involving only a single letter, is the more easily explicable, because some of the early Fathers understood 'if I give my body' to refer to martyrdom, whereas St. Paul has in view such cases as are mentioned by Clement of Rome (*Ep. Cor.* lv.): 'Many kings and rulers . . . have delivered themselves over to death, that they might rescue their fellow-citizens through their own blood.' Finally, to prove that the thought involved in his exposition is apostolic, Harnack pertinently quotes 1 Jn 4<sup>17</sup>: 'Herein is love made perfect with us, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment' (2 Co 7<sup>4</sup> shows that 'boldness' and 'glorying' are parallel ideas).

In v.<sup>7</sup> Harnack prefers 'covereth' to 'beareth' as the rendering (cf. RVm) of *στέγει*. The translation 'beareth' (R.V.) too closely approximates to the meaning of *ὑπομένει* (R.V. 'endureth') in the same verse. Clement of Rome quotes 1 P 4<sup>8</sup>, 'love covereth (*καλύπτει*) a multitude of sins' (*Ep. Cor.* xlix.) before sentences taken from this chapter. The climax of part two (vv. 4-7) is found in the words, 'love rejoiceth in the truth,' for Harnack holds that in *συχχαίρει* (R.V. 'rejoiceth with') the *σύν* is strengthening, the compound form of the verb being used for the sake of the rhythm. In support of this rendering he quotes 1 Co 5<sup>8</sup>, Ro 2<sup>8</sup>, 2 Th 2<sup>12</sup>, Clem. Rom. *Ep. Cor.* xxxv. 5, Clem. Alex. (*Quis dives*, xxxviii.).

Much of the charm of Harnack's exposition lies in the aptness of his illustrative quotations. In Nu 12<sup>8</sup>, 'With him (Moses) I will speak mouth to mouth, even manifestly, not in dark speeches,' he finds the clue to the interpretation of St. Paul's words: 'Now we see in a mirror, in a riddle; but then face to face' (v.<sup>12</sup>). Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* i. 19, 94) regards the 'mirror' as referring to the knowledge of God derived from self-knowledge and from knowledge of our brethren. But Harnack sees no reason for such limitation. 'Certainly Paul is thinking also of the mirroring (*Spiegelung*)



of God in nature and in history.' Attention is also called to the different use of the figure in the newly discovered *Odes of Solomon* (13): 'Behold, the Lord is our mirror: open the eyes and see them in Him: and learn the manner of your face.' Dr. Rendel Harris also notes that in the Ode 'the thought is not as high as in Corinthians, where holiness is found by the Vision of God rather than by the scrutiny of ourselves.'

Passing, in the latter half of his paper, to the contents of the chapter as a whole, Harnack comments suggestively on its style. In form it is the most sublime of all St. Paul's writings. 'Poetry, in the strict sense of the word, the Hymn is not, but it is oratory (*Rede*); therefore to describe it as a hymn is not quite correct.' Its rhythm and its poetic form, as well as its literary grace, are due to its inspiring thought and its intense emotion. The Hymn consists of three parts and a closing verse: the necessity of love (vv.<sup>1-3</sup>); the nature and effects of love (vv.<sup>4-7</sup>); the perpetuity of love (vv.<sup>8-12</sup>). The æsthetic attractiveness of the Hymn is ascribed to the exquisite choice of words, the combined strength and simplicity of the style, and the effective use of antithesis and repetition. With the exception of the first verse, no use is made of 'descriptive and picturesque adjectives.' The emphasis is invariably on the verb, so that, paradoxical as it may sound, the Hymn is as remarkable for its animation and movement as for its statuesque grace ('*so erhält der Lobgesang die lebhafteste innere Bewegung neben einer lapidaren Monumentalität*').

The stylistic differences of the three parts are admirably brought out: as, e.g., the parallel construction of vv.<sup>1-3</sup>, the ascensive use in each verse of the clause 'but have not love,' and the climactic effect of the brevity of the close of vv.<sup>2, 3</sup>—two words in the Greek—'I am nothing' and 'I am profited nothing.' Harnack's retention of the 'I,' which is the subject throughout this part, brings out what its dominance signifies, the incontrovertibility of the Apostle's assertions. In part two the solemn threefold use of 'love' in v.<sup>4</sup>—(note the chiasmus)—introduces three of its main attributes, but in the following verses the heart of the Apostle is too full to allow of the repeated utterance of the word; eight negative sentences introduced by *οὐ* are followed by four positive statements introduced by *πάντα*. 'The style becomes increasingly impetuous, the words

appear to tumble over each other; but it is merely in appearance—each word stands firmly in its place. The ecstasy is an ecstasy *ἐν νοῷ*.' In part three the tone changes. Three chiselled words (*lapidaren Worten*)—'love never faileth'—introduce the closing theme. But immediately the writer's inward emotion is reflected in the twofold interchange of plural and singular (plural in vv.<sup>9, 12a</sup>, singular in vv.<sup>11, 12b</sup>). The 'I' is typical, not individual, but the change is impressive. Note is also taken of the rhetorical effect of the five times repeated *νήπιος* in v.<sup>11</sup>, of the contrasts (*ἀρτι* and *τότε*) and antithesis in v.<sup>12</sup>, also of the correspondence of the three tenses in v.<sup>12</sup> to the preceding antithesis. In the closing verse, by 'a genial diversion,' the word 'abideth' is used instead of 'never faileth,' and the climax is reached in the statement of which 'love' is the final and emphatic word: 'the greatest of these is love.'

For the student of the history of religions the interest of the chapter lies, according to Harnack, not in discussions raised by some modern scholars concerning 'tongues of angels' and a clanging cymbal,' but in discovering the relation to Greek thought of St. Paul's teaching in regard to love and knowledge. In some respects it is manifest that Paul, so far from being the disciple of Plato, differs essentially from Greek philosophers. 'They blend knowledge and love (*amor intellectualis*). Paul separates them; they recognize, indeed, a gradually increasing knowledge, but qualitatively all knowledge is identical, Paul denies this; according to them our present knowledge, notwithstanding its imperfection, is the best thing in the world, Paul is far removed from this faith.' In these and in some other respects 'Paul is a Jew, and desires to know nothing of the wisdom of the Greeks.'

But St. Paul's depreciatory estimate of knowledge refers to present conditions, or to knowledge 'in part.' Of perfect knowledge his judgment is very different. In this particular it may still be asked: Does not his teaching resemble Plato's? According to the Apostle, 'the best thing in the world, the best thing in this temporal state, is love; but the absolute best, for which his soul longs, is perfect knowledge, knowledge "face to face," knowledge in which "I shall know, even as also I have been known."' To this knowledge the Apostle's thought turns in this chapter as he hymns the praise of love, and in another passage

in this Epistle (8<sup>3</sup>) he takes a step in advance and says: 'If any man loveth God, the same is known of him.'

The result of Harnack's inquiry is that he finds in 1 Co 13, confirmation of his view that only those Christian ideas and institutions survived and became Catholic which have a twofold origin. 'Catholic Christianity is the product of two converging lines which ultimately meet; of these two lines one begins with the prophets and may be traced through the later Psalms to its development in late Judaism, including early Christianity; the other line is discernible in the development of the Greek philosophy of religion, inclusive of the mysteries.' Not only do the two main lines converge and finally meet in the third and fourth centuries, but from them side lines diverge and meet each other.

St. Paul's high estimate of perfect knowledge is, in Harnack's opinion, accounted for by his Jewish education; even his conviction that the highest knowledge is the knowledge of God was not, in the first instance, derived from Platonism. A minute study of Nu 12<sup>8</sup> is held to show, not only that it underlies v. 12, but that it explains the phrase which seems at first Platonic, namely, 'in a mirror.' The Pauline phrase δι' ἐσόπτρου corresponds to the LXX ἐν εἶδει (Heb. מִרְאָה). 'This word explains at once the βλέπομεν and the δι' ἐσόπτρου of Paul; for מִרְאָה means not only "seeing" and "what is seen," but also "appearance" as distinguished from "essence," and finally "mirror" (Ex 38<sup>8</sup>). The figure of speech is accounted for by St. Paul's knowledge of the word as it occurs in the passage which was before his mind. He 'longed to see God, as once Moses was promised that he should see God; there is no necessity to have recourse to Plato.' It cannot, however, be denied that a Greek philosopher might have used this figure of speech, and it may be questioned whether St. Paul could have given such sublimity, by means of so slight a change, to the familiar saying, had he not breathed the Hellenic air. 'Two converging lines in world-history meet here.'

The sentence 'then shall I know even as also I have been known' would have been understood by Plato, but it would not have conveyed to his mind St. Paul's teaching. The Apostle's meaning is clear from 8<sup>3</sup>: 'If any man loveth God, the

same is known of him.' With the implication that truth and unrighteousness are incompatible, Plato was, however, in complete agreement.

Harnack's contention that throughout this chapter St. Paul is thinking of the love of one's neighbour does not carry conviction, and he himself acknowledges that 'for Paul love, even as love of our neighbour, is inseparable from the love of God.' In the Apostolic age he finds evidence of the *converging*, but not of the *meeting*, of two lines of development of thought: 'the humanitarian-Stoic, and the theistic-Jewish.' It is granted, however, that 'in Hellenism (as, e.g., in Epictetus) a strong religious element blended with the humanitarian conception.' Yet, strange to say, the thought of St. Paul is said to move only on the humanitarian line; apparently Harnack intends this assertion to be understood in the light of another statement which seems to justify a wider interpretation of 'love' in this chapter: 'in and with love to our neighbour, the love of God, religion itself, is included.' If the love of God and the love of our neighbour are conceptions so nearly akin, if indeed they form 'such a unity as to be interchangeable,' there seems to be no valid reason for confining St. Paul's statements concerning 'love' within humanitarian lines, more especially as Harnack lays special stress on the theistic-Jewish element in the Apostle's teaching.

In his closing paragraph Harnack reaffirms his conviction that 'as Paul was not a Greek, so he never became a Greek.' Yet Bishop Hicks has said: 'I never read 1 Co 13 without thinking of the virtues in the *Nicomachean Ethics*. St. Paul's ethical teaching has quite a Hellenic ring. It is philosophical, as resting on a definite principle, namely, our new life in Christ; and it is logical, as classifying virtues and duties according to some intelligible principle' (*Studia Biblica*, ix. 9). Harnack would allow 'the Hellenic ring,' though probably he would not regard St. Paul's ethics as 'philosophical.' He is not surprised that some of the Apostle's ideas have been found growing in Greek soil; but he maintains that 'the Apostle would not have adopted them, unless they had fitted in with knowledge which he already possessed during his religious training as a Jew.' His experience, as a Christian, enabled him to transform this knowledge, but 'the Apostle of the Gentiles remained a Jew, in so far as he was not a Christian. . . . That his thoughts were influential subsequent



to the Hellenic age is due, in the first instance, not to the slight Greek element found in them, but to the power which enabled the Apostle anew to proclaim the ancient God of the Jews as the Father of Jesus Christ, and to place love at the centre.'

This fascinating and brilliant study suggests a further question: May not St. Paul's knowledge of the Christ in whom there is 'neither Jew nor Greek' explain the meeting in his teaching of the two converging lines? Even so far as this eulogy of love is concerned, there is great force in the

words of the Rev. Bernard Lucas: 'It was the life of love which Jesus lived which made the Psalm of love which Paul wrote possible. We have but to substitute Jesus for love, the person for the thing personified, and Paul's panegyric becomes a simple and perfect description of the historic Jesus. As a literal portrayal of the character of Jesus it cannot be surpassed. . . . Is it any wonder, therefore, that as a manifestation of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, Paul should assign the supreme place to love?' (*The Fifth Gospel*, p. 153).

## In the Study.

### Virginibus Puerisque.

#### Skill.

BY THE REV. JAMES HENDRY, M.A., FORRES.

'There is not among us any who can skill to hew timber like unto the Sidonians.'—1 K 5<sup>6</sup>.

It is our wisdom to recognize that other people can do some things better than ourselves. It is our wisdom either to learn of them, or by fair business to avail ourselves of their skill. Some would say that in the building of the Temple, only Israelite material and Israelite workmanship should be used, even if inferior to what heathen Hiram could give. Solomon's wisdom said, 'The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein.' It is the cedars of God that grow on Lebanon. The heathen craftsmen have their skill from God. And so, the timber and the skill of the Sidonians were used, and at the dedication of the Temple Solomon made one prayer specially for strangers who might worship there, and a millennium later the Lord Jesus in purging the House declared that His Father's House was meant to be a House of prayer for all nations.

Instead of the Temple, built for the Name of the Lord for a time, we have now the Holy Scriptures, declaring the Word of the Lord for all time. Let us consider to whose skill it is due that we have a printed Bible, in which every one of us can commune with the Lord over all His Word to us. Could you skill to make that which is least—the ink with which your Bible is printed? Before you

could have your Bible, God had to have his gall-flies at work in His oak-forests, and His poor people gathering the oak-galls, and passing them on to His chemists who can now skill to produce that unfading ink with which Bibles are printed. Could you skill to manufacture the paper? Left to ourselves most of us would have to fall back on more primitive writing materials—bricks of clay, or tablets of wood, or skins and hides, or bulrushes sliced and pasted together, and we are debtors to all who through long centuries kept up their writing and preserved the Scriptures on these clumsy materials. For paper itself we are indebted to heathen Turkestan, and to the Arabs who there discovered it and the way to make it. But almost till the invention of printing six centuries later, Christian Europe scarce thought such a heathen and Muhammadan article worth minding. But now the rag-collector sorts out every scrap of linen to be used for a Bible or some book of value. Could you skill to put the rags through all the process needful to make the fine, firm, faultless paper of your Bible? You are indebted to those who can skill to do so, and you are indebted to the rag-gatherer. No rag-gathering, no Bible for you such as you have, to fit you for every good work, and in your good work you should forget neither the humble people nor the skilful people who have worked together to fashion the page on which the heavenly treasure is set forth to you.

Now we have to get that greatest thing, the Word of God, to put on the paper. That Word did not come forth from us. None of us could skill to produce it. It is God's Word—written by

Him in the whole experience of Israel, and in an unceasing succession of living epistles, and some of these were qualified by His Spirit to record what God wrote into the life of Israel and into their own souls. And then He wrote His perfect Word in the Life that was manifested in the Lord Jesus, and qualified some to record and interpret that writing. For the Word which now is published to the ends of the earth, we are debtors under God to all the long and manifold experience of Israel, and to the height and depth of the experience of Christ. But the original record of the Word is useless to us, unless some one interpret. So another class of workers is needed, a succession of scholars laboriously perfecting themselves in the skill to keep the dead Hebrew and Greek speaking the living language of each new generation. Some Bible-readers disdain to own any indebtedness either to scholars or to rag-collectors. God's wisdom uses them both.

Now could you skill to do the printing? Yet, first, could you skill to make a printing machine, one that could produce your Bible at the price you paid for it? Why, you must go further back, and take account of multitudes of men learning through the centuries how to skill in mining, how to skill in smelting the mineral ores, how to skill the first rude invention, and then the perfecting of the printing press. And it is all made to work together for you, that each of you may have in your hands the Scriptures which are able to make you wise to salvation.

Enlarge your thoughts. You must take account of all shipbuilding skill, and of all the seamen, for some of the indispensable material comes from abroad, and the Word itself came from abroad. You must add the skill of all the distributing agencies, all railway skill, the skill of all carriers and merchants. These workers of all the ages had to be fed, and clad, and housed, and so you must take in all those skilled in the production and preparation of every kind of food and clothing, and all who can skill to quarry stone and hew timber, all the building trades, all the furnishing trades, all the women who care for the home,—aye, and as human hearts are merry and are sad, you must include those who can skill in music. And as it was with Solomon's workers, there must be all kinds of officers from kings downwards, legislators, judges, armies and navies, captains of industry, doctors lawyers, bankers, all of every degree who help

to keep things going decently and in order. They have all made a contribution to the work that had to be done ere you could get the Bible you have got. Reduce the skill of any set of any of these endless workers, and you will add to the cost of your Bible; increase the skill of any of them, and you will get a cheaper or a better book. You wonder at the vast number of Solomon's workers, but what are they to the countless millions who through the ages have contributed to the skill required to furnish that Bible to you. In the Chronicles we are told that Solomon's army of burden-bearers and quarrymen were slaves, of the old Canaanites of the land, and you shudder at the thought of the Temple of God being built by such labour. Yet of old, and until to-day, among the millions working together for the furnishing of your own Bible, the great mass of them have been enslaved, oppressed, sweated, and for the most part unaware, until they went beyond this life, that God had a Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. You never would have had your Bible, had not even the Lord of Glory humbled Himself to burden and agony and death. Your Bible is marked with blood of His, that cannot be hid. Aye, and for the preservation of the Bible to you, He required multitudes of His martyrs to give up their lives rather than give up their written portions of His Word. Neither can you enter for yourself into the benefit of your Bible, without finding yourself moved to cross-bearing of your own in doing justly and loving mercy and seeking to work deliverance on the earth. Do you skill to read your Bible so as to have that mind in you? Why, here is another class of workers—those who taught us to read,—and some of us would never have been taught, had not Cæsar, forty years ago, made a decree that, in spite of the objections of many, all the children should be schooled. And so, by the skill to read—so little and yet so great a skill—the work of all the other workers is made available, and all the treasures of the heavenly wisdom are at the disposal of whosoever will read.

Blessed is he who reads and considers, for he will get the witness in himself that God is speaking to him, and speaking His chiefest Word, Jesus Christ, into him, in order that he himself may become a Temple of God. And in that Temple your worshipping heart will hear the Father's voice reminding you, that you are set in the midst of



other children of His, all of them precious to Him as you are,—and you are very precious. Yet Christ died for the others also, and you are in their midst not to condemn yourselves to uselessness by withdrawing into a shell of your own away from them, as if without them you could be perfected. You are in their midst to remember that He who is your Head has been Head over them all to make them all contribute some measure of service and skill towards your having the Word of God in the form you do have it, and therefore you are in their midst like your Saviour to serve, and to be one of His living epistles to them. If you consider

how God has made you dependent on, and indebted to, all this endless skill and labour of all men, even for God's own Word in your hands, surely your heart will muse and meditate, till it burn within you, and make you to speak and to purpose before God like Paul, when he said, 'I am debtor both to the Greeks and to the Barbarians, both to the wise and to the unwise'; and therefore, as much as lieth in me, I must be ready to use my own measure of skill in the service of the gospel, for in some matter or towards some person, it will doubtless be the case that even I can skill to hew timber better than any one else.

## The Attitude of the Outspread Hands ('Orante') in Early Christian Literature and Art.

BY DR. D. PLOOIJ, TIEL, HOLLAND.

### II.

BAPTISM in ancient Christianity had a far more than symbolic meaning. It was a mystic *reality*, a guarantee and seal of new birth. In the centre of all baptismal ideas and beliefs in the ancient Church stands the word of Christ: ἄν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῇτε οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν; and the word of Paul (Ro 6<sup>7</sup>): ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν δεδικαίωται τῆς ἁμαρτίας: Christianity is new life, but new life is possible only through death. One must die first, that new life can begin. Now this death may be a real one, as in martyrdom for the sake of Christ; then it is as is said in *Didasc. Syr.*: 'Wenn wir nun zum Martyrium um seines Namens willen berufen werden, und mit dem Bekenntniß aus der Welt gehen, so werden wir rein sein von allen Sünden und Vergehungen und als unschuldig erfunden werden.'<sup>1</sup> Or to put it with the words of *Const. Aeg.* xiv. 3: 'Si enim fit ut ei (namely, a catechumen who is *not* yet baptized) vis inferatur et interficiatur ad peccata sua redimenda justificabitur; baptismum enim in proprio sanguine accepit.'<sup>2</sup>

But it may be also a mystical death as symbolized and wrought in baptism, not less real, only its reality is of another kind. The parallelism of baptism and death must be derived from a

word of Christ Himself; cf. Mk 10<sup>38</sup>: δύνασθε . . . τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι βαπτισθῆναι;<sup>3</sup> I do not believe that the sons of Zebedee understood the meaning of these words when they answered, 'We can.' There is no trace that this parallelism was in use before Christ. Nearly all other baptismal ideas and customs we can follow in their origins into Judaism, or further into early Semitic religion, but as far as I know baptism as a symbol of death, especially of martyrdom, does not occur before our era, and in the quoted words of Christ we may see the evidence that it was He who first drew the parallel,<sup>4</sup> probably seeing in His

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Lk 12<sup>50</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> The only Semitic pre-Christian sphere of ideas which might be congenial to the *later* development of this parallelism is that of the dragon lurking in the waters, no doubt a very old Semitic monstium related to the great Tiamât, which must be conquered. In Egypt we might find some parallel in the rites, *e.g.*, of Abydos, where 'le dieu Thot sortait en bateau pour repêcher le corps d'Osiris. Ailleurs c'était Isis qui voguait à sa recherche' (Cumont, *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme Romain*, p. 278, Paris, 1907). Perhaps an echo of such speculations may be heard in the word of Zeno Veronensis, lib. ii. tract. 39, ad neophytos: 'Cum omnium aquarum natura sit talis ut cum in profundum homines suscipiat vivos, evomat mortuos, aqua nostra suscipit mortuos et evomit vivos.' It is for this reason, I believe, that the story of Jonah is so frequently painted in early Christian art of the Catacombs.

<sup>1</sup> Ed. Achelis, Leipzig, 1904, T.u.U., N.F. x. 2, S. 102.

<sup>2</sup> Funk, *Didasc. et Const. Ap.* vol. ii., Paderborn, 1906.

own baptism in the Jordan a prophecy of His own passion and death according to the interpretation of passages as Ps 42<sup>8</sup>, Ps 69<sup>2</sup>; Ps 124<sup>4, 5</sup>. At all events, the sons of Zebedee did not understand the allegorical meaning of Jesus' words, as may be inferred from their dreams of power and honour even at the moment Jesus spoke to them on passion and death.

But a few years afterwards, when Paul writes to the members of the Roman Church, it is self-evident to him that his readers understand him when he writes: 'Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his *death*? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death' (Ro 6<sup>4f.</sup>); cf. Col 2<sup>12</sup>. So in baptism the mystical, *i.e.* *real*, union with Christ and His death is symbolized, to be baptized is to participate in His death and to be buried in the grave from which through the power of Christ we too will rise with Him into new life. This idea remains unchanged in the early history of baptism, or rather it grows more massive, when regeneration as it is wrought in baptism grows more and more magic and mechanic, and so it is dominant in all baptismal controversies even in the later history of the Church. To Paul, however, regeneration was a spiritual experience of life of which baptism was the symbol. To him surely a symbol means more than to our modern thought: there is a mystic and mysterious connexion between the symbol and the experience signified by it, but the spiritual is fundamental. To the following generations the symbol *per se* was the magic medium through which death and birth are brought about. To quote only one witness: Cyprian, in his Ep. 71 c. 1 (ed. Hartel, p. 722), argues that baptism can never be administered by a heretic, for 'it is clear that those who are not in the Church of Christ are dead, and so it is impossible that another person can be made living by him who does not live himself.'

But it is not only the parallelism of baptism and death, but also that of baptism and passion, *i.e.* crucifixion, which is speculated upon, first by Paul and after him in all baptismal literature and liturgy. In Ro 6<sup>6</sup>, having spoken of baptism, Paul proceeds, saying, 'that our old man is crucified with him'; and in Gal 2<sup>20</sup>, he says, 'I am crucified with Christ.' Undoubtedly Paul meant with these words something more than we are inclined to

understand from them. I am not sure of it, but I believe there is a strong evidence that he was conscious of such symbolic stretching out of the hands in the form of the cross which we have been discussing. We need not think of dead liturgy when we suppose that Paul alludes to such confessional act and union with Christ practised by the catechumens in his time, no more than we have to do so when finding such various symbolical acts alluded to in the Odes of Solomon. The living faith, the desire to express faith in visible acts, which in those times and circles, especially in Eastern regions, was far stronger than in our abstract century and for our Western character, could not but produce such confessional symbols, which in their mystic significance for the second and third generation became almost sacramental.

Thus not only the symbolic meaning of the outstretched hands, but also the combination of it with baptism, and so the baptismal use of it, are explained. There remains, however, one point to be discussed: the attitude of the so-called 'orante' in Christian art. For we find it not only, as we have seen, in liturgical literature, but far more frequently and impressively in ancient Christian art, which—it may be said directly—for the most part, at least in the earliest times, had a sepulchral character. For the interpretations of the early Christian sepulchral symbols, Wilpert in his standard work has given some perfectly sound and strict principles, of which I quote as especially important: 'Als obersten Grundsatz, als erste Pflicht hat der Interpret beständig im Auge zu halten dass er Bilder welche Grabstätten schmücken, erklären soll. Die Funeralsymbolik ist ganz von der Heilsidee beherrscht und durchdrungen.'<sup>1</sup> As far as I know, the full consequence of this principle has not yet been drawn out. LE BLANT and, after him, WILPERT have acknowledged the value of ancient *funeral* liturgies, but the importance of the baptismal liturgies is far greater. In later times the *day of death* is the beginning of new life, as may be seen from every calendar; but in early Christianity, not the day of death, but the *day of baptism* was the birthday of new life,<sup>2</sup> and

<sup>1</sup> *Malereien*, Tekstband, S. 140.

<sup>2</sup> The connexion between both lies, of course, in the idea of baptism of blood and baptism of water. For martyrs the day of death was the birthday of new life; for all other believers it was the day of baptism.



to have received baptism was to be sure of heavenly happiness and salvation, yea, to have received it already. Augustinus says: 'Aqua velut morientem deducit in tumulum; spiritus sanctus velut resurgentem perducit ad caelum,'<sup>1</sup> and to mention a witness from heretic circles in earlier times: Hippolytus says of the Naässenes: ἡ γὰρ ἐπαγγελία τοῦ λουτροῦ οὐκ ἄλλη τίς ἐστι κατ' αὐτοὺς ἢ τὸ εἰσαγαγεῖν εἰς τὴν ἀμάρτανον ἡδονὴν τὸν λουόμενον κατ' αὐτοὺς ζῶντι ὕδατι καὶ χριόμενον ἀλάφ χρίσματος.<sup>2</sup> Such passages, which may be found at every turn in early Christian literature, show that baptism for the early Christians was not only a symbol of their death with Christ, but also a guarantee of their life with Him, and this not only in the future but already in this present life: 'Buried with him in baptism, wherein ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead' (Col 2<sup>12</sup>). Baptism is birth, with baptism the new life begins, the unbaptized is dead. I will give only a few examples more which may stand for many others. Justin, *Apol.* i. 61, says: 'After that they (the catechumens) are brought by us unto a place where is water, and there they are born again in the same way as we have been born again . . . καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπεν· ἂν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῇτε οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν' Here ἀναγέννησις is used entirely as a synonym for βάπτισμος. In baptismal literature we find regularly used: 'birth' simply in the sense of new birth, and, e.g., in an epitaph printed by De Rossi, *Roma Sotteranea*, i. tav. 17, 2, we read: *Maxema qu(a)e vixit in pace annos(=annos) triginta, i.e. Maxima has lived thirty years after being baptized.* In 'The Precepts of [En-katzi and] Warden about Baptism,' translated by Conybeare in his *Rituale Armenorum*, p. 107, we find: 'And that the priest plunges the child three times successively into the water conveys the mystery of the three days' burial of Christ as if the child was buried with Christ. And his bringing up out of the water is as if he ascended with Christ from the dead into heaven. For the bema is a model of heaven.' Perhaps the strongest example of the synonymic use of baptism and birth, is that in an Epiphany canticle (Conybeare, *Rit. Arm.* p. 178) where it is said: 'Blessed Saviour Emanuel, born of the Virgin—by way of rebirth wast thou baptized to-day in the Jordan.'

<sup>1</sup> 'Liber testimoniorum fidei contra Donatistas,' c. viii. (in Pitras, *Anal. Sacra*, p. 150<sup>b</sup>).

<sup>2</sup> *Refut.* v. 7 (p. 100), 86, ed. Duncker et Schneidewin.

Finally, I quote an epitaph found on the *Via Latina* in the middle of the nineteenth century and printed, i.e., by Dölger,<sup>3</sup> of which I reprint the verses:

κάθανε καὶ ζῶει καὶ ὁρᾷ φάος ἄφθιτον ὄντως.  
ζῶει μὲν ζωοῖσι θάνεν δὲ θανοῦσιν ἀληθῶς.

All this will be justification enough of my thesis, when I say that to understand and to explain the early Christian sepulchral symbols and paintings we have, in the first place, to consult not only the funeral liturgies, but also the baptismal literature. The more because there are several paintings and among them the very oldest, which *omnium consensu* have a baptismal meaning.

In explaining the figure of the 'orante,' one of the most frequent figures in the catacombs and on the sarcophagi, hitherto it has been neglected that the attitude as a prayer-act is not peculiar to Christianity. It is the name 'orante' which as a doom lies on the interpretation of the figure. For not only the Christians, but in the same way and much earlier the heathens, prayed in this attitude. Christians have taken it over, and that they retained it was in consequence of the cross which they saw symbolized in it. Then, already for this reason, the important meaning of the 'orante' cannot be the *prayer*, which might be expressed by it, but the symbolism of the cross which early Christians saw involved in it. The sepulchral symbols have a *hidden* meaning: only those who have been initiated in the Christian mysteries know the significance of the fish, the anchor, the dove, Noah in the ark, etc. A pagan eye could see only the outward history. Then in the 'orante' not the prayer is the hidden meaning, but the cross of the outstretched hands.

Wilpert<sup>4</sup> thinks that the 'orante' expresses the intercession of the deceased, for the surviving, and refers for this opinion to some inscriptions of the third and fourth centuries, which testify such intercession. But Dr. Oberman<sup>5</sup> argues that so often figures of saints painted in company of 'orantes' are not represented in a praying attitude, and that there are other epitaphs which ask the prayer of the surviving for the deceased.

<sup>3</sup> IXOTZ, *Das Fischsymbol in Früh-christlicher Zeit*, Bd. i. S. 169, Rom, 1910.

<sup>4</sup> *Malereien*, Tekstband, S. 457.

<sup>5</sup> *De Oud-Christelijke Sarkophagen*, 's Gravenhage, 1911, p. 37.

Von Sybel<sup>1</sup> and Oberman<sup>2</sup> explain the praying attitude as denoting not intercession, but adoration. It is in the presence of God that the 'orante' is represented, so his prayer is prayer of adoration. But why, then, are Noah in the ark, the three youths in the furnace, Susanna—to mention only the older representatives of the 'orante' figure—represented as 'orante'? There, at least, adoration in the presence of God seems entirely out of place.

All difficulties, however, seem to fall away when not prayer but confession of Christ is the first meaning of the stretching out of the hands. After our inquiry this meaning of the 'orante' may be esteemed to be beyond question, and it may be asked if this is not the right meaning also in early Christian art. In some paintings the meaning of prayer may remain unshaken, but, e.g., merely by seeing in the attitude of the 'orante' a symbol of baptismal confession it becomes clear why Noah in the ark (a baptismal symbol too!) is painted as 'orante.' And the same observation may be made in other paintings, e.g. the three youths in the furnace are a symbol of baptism,<sup>3</sup> and therefore painted as 'orantes.' Ephrem (*Hymn.* ed. Lamy, i. 77) says: 'The three illustrious men in Babel were baptized in the furnace of fire, and emerged from it. They were entered and had bathed in the womb of the flame . . . heavenly dew moistened them there . . . the real fire that blazed signifies the fire and the Holy Ghost who is mixed and hidden in the water. By the flame he typifies baptism.' And Zeno Veronensis (lib. ii. tract. 71) gives the same interpretation of the men in the furnace: 'They were not wanting the grace of baptism in the furnace filled with cooling dew.' To this may be added, that for the interpretation of the dove with the branch of olive to be found on one of the paintings of the three men in the furnace (reproduced by Wilpert, *loc. cit.* Taf. 78, see *Tekstband*, S. 358<sup>3</sup>), and which is rather astonishing in its surrounding, we may listen to the 'Orationes S. Basilii Magni episcopi' given in Syriac text and Latin translation by Assemanus, *Cod. liturg.* iii. p. 199 ff. There we read (p. 224): 'Tu modo etiam Domine Deus, mitte super aquas istas (baptismi) per sanctum hoc verae unctionis oleum columbam tuam illam, quae est supra omnia saecula,' etc., and p. 225: 'In ramo

olivae mysterium olei annuntiavit columba Justo (Noe).' We cannot pursue this further here, but all this points to a direction which hitherto has been neglected, and which may yet give light to many an ancient Christian symbol hitherto not sufficiently explained.

So when we see the three men painted in the attitude of 'orante,' it is not the attitude of adoration, but the baptismal confession which is alluded to. Only continued study in this direction can make this all clear in its connexions. I will only give two examples which confirm the given interpretation. De Rossi, *Roma Sotterr.* tom. ii. tav. xl. nr 8, 11, gives reproductions of two 'orantes,' which show the stigmata Christi in their hands. If these reproductions are correct, and there is no reason to doubt it, these paintings confirm the interpretation of the 'orante' as a symbol of the cross and the confession of Christ, and illustrate a passage to which Dr. Dölger, Würzburg, in a communication of 5th September 1911, draws my attention, in *Clem. Alex. Exc. ex Theodoto*, c. 86, §§ 1-3 (ed. Stählin, iii. 135), where it is said of the baptized that he bears the stigmata Christi in himself.

And second: Wilpert gives (Taf. 207) a beautiful reproduction of an acrosol-painting in Cimiterium maius, representing, according to him: 'Madonna betend und mit dem Jesus knaben.' I can leave undiscussed the question if Wilpert is right in seeing Madonna in the woman and Jesus in the child. I will only draw attention to the two monograms of Christ painted at each side of the woman: they have the same design as the attitude of the 'orante,' namely, to express a confession of Christ, and so the two symbols explain each other mutually.

I repeat that the 'orante' sometimes can express prayer; of course, for it was attitude of prayer too. And I do not say that only a living person when being baptized, could be represented so; the painted symbol is only a reminder of baptism as a guarantee and beginning of new life, and this new life is continued in heaven where believers praise God and confess Christ as on earth. What I mean to say is only that the peculiar meaning of the 'orante' is the cross and the baptismal confession of Christ.

Thus also early Christian art is a witness to the old baptismal rite we found in the Odes of Solomon and in baptismal rituals. It survived

<sup>1</sup> *Chr. Antike*, i. S. 262.

<sup>2</sup> *Loc. cit.* p. 47.

<sup>3</sup> A combination of *baptismus sanguinis* and *baptismus fluminis*!



only in forgotten corners of Christianity, and even there it will be now quite extinct, I suppose. In Christian art it became traditional even when the confessional meaning was forgotten, for the custom

of praying in this attitude remained. It is for this reason that for *later* times the explanation as prayer—*adoratio* or even *intercessio*—may be the right one.

## Literature.

### EUCKEN.

ALL the books that Professor Rudolf Eucken has written (and most of them have been translated into English) are to be passed by for the present until we have read and reread and altogether mastered *Life's Basis and Life's Ideal*. For this book, which has been well translated by Mr. Alban G. Widgery, and has been published by Messrs. A. & C. Black (7s. 6d. net), is not only the latest but also the clearest statement of his philosophical position that Professor Eucken has yet given us.

We say it is well translated. Mr. Widgery has had special advantages. He knows Eucken; he knows him intimately and appreciates him. And to know Eucken intimately and appreciate him is to know his philosophy. His philosophy is the outcome of his attitude to life. To know the man is to understand, better than from all his written works, what he means when he speaks of the development of personality and spiritual individuality.

This book is, we have also said, the latest of Professor Eucken's books. That also is a great consideration. For Professor Eucken's mind is active. Has he a philosophical system? You may call it a system if you please. But it is not a system that is finished and at a standstill. While he lives he thinks, and as long as he lives you will never be sure that you have his last and best word. Therefore read the latest book always. Coming from Professor Eucken it is likely to be the best.

This, at least, is the best hitherto. It is not the clearest. Or at any rate it is not the easiest. It demands study, patient and determined. But it yields the most satisfactory results. It brings out the far-reaching issues that are involved in this philosophy of life, and it lifts the author himself to a mental and moral height which he had not attained before. In popular opinion Eucken

and Bergson are struggling for the mastery. Probably Bergson will win; but Eucken, though he may never become so popular, is likely to live longer.

The Rev. H. W. Morrow, M.A., of Trinity Church, Omagh, having preached a course of sermons on questions put by Christ, and another course on questions put to Christ, has published both courses in a volume entitled *Questions asked and answered by our Lord* (Allenson; 3s. 6d.). The idea is not original; but it is not an accidental idea. Each question has matter in it for many sermons, and the value of the questions is doubled by being considered together. So these sermons of Mr. Morrow's may be read with profit, even by those who have read the sermons of Mr. Bain and Mr. Knight. Their brevity is a surprise, so evangelical are they and even so theological.

The late Professor Adamson of Glasgow wrote the article on 'Logic' for the ninth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Before printing it the editor cut it down. Professor Adamson thought that it suffered in that process, and Professor Sorley of Cambridge, who has discovered the original manuscript, agrees with him. Professor Sorley has accordingly edited the manuscript and published it, together with other four articles, in a volume to which he has given the title *A Short History of Logic* (Blackwood; 5s. net). An encyclopædia article is expected to be intelligible to everybody. With the exception of an occasional phrase in Greek, Professor Adamson's article is intelligible. But the book has the appearance of being prepared for the student rather than for the general reader; and for the student no other convenient manual for the history of Logic is in existence.

Professor H. J. White, who worked so long

with the late Bishop Wordsworth of Salisbury on the great critical edition of the Vulgate, has prepared a small edition of the Vulgate New Testament with a selected *apparatus criticus*, which has been published at the Clarendon Press in Oxford (2s. net; and on Oxford India paper, 3s. net). It is an edition which will at once supersede all other small editions. The title is in Latin—*Novum Testamentum Latine: Editio Minor*.

The editing of a magazine like the *Christian World Pulpit* may seem a simple affair. You have just to collect the sermons and fit them into the space. But ask the editor. Ask him what it costs to make the *Christian World Pulpit* representative of the pulpit of the Christian world. Ask him what it means to select the very best sermons, and especially what it means to reject the rest. The new volume (July to December 1911) is the eightieth. It contains sermons by no fewer than 138 preachers, among whom the most conspicuous are Mr. R. J. Campbell, Canon Hensley Henson, Mr. Stuart Holden, Dr. Horton, Dr. Newton Marshall, and the Bishop of Wakefield (Clarke & Co.; 4s. 6d.).

The latest volume of Messrs. Constable's 'Philosophies' will be the most popular. For its subject is *Bergson*, and its author is Mr. Joseph Solomon (1s. net). In size it is little more than a large magazine article. But as an introduction to Bergson no magazine article that we have seen comes within sight of this book.

To throw the imagination round a fact is not to make the fact less, although it may give it the outward appearance of fiction. Therefore the volume of tales and essays by Mahlon Cooper is called *Fact and Fiction* (Daniel; 5s. net). Did the author contribute these tales and essays to some magazine? If not, what an opportunity the magazines have missed.

Short and practical and very modern are the sermons which the Rev. Edwin P. Barrow, M.A., has gathered into a volume with the title of *The Way not a Sect* (Dent; 4s. 6d. net). The title is taken from the first sermon in the volume, of which the text is Ac 24<sup>14</sup>: 'This I confess unto thee, that after the Way which they call a sect, so serve I the God of our fathers.' The sermon is

an argument against the sectarian spirit. It may be necessary to form a new Way, as it was with Paul and Wesley, but it is not necessary to form a new sect, and it must never be done. 'It has been the aim of the truest reformers from the time of Paul to the time of Wesley, and from Wesley to Martineau, to prevent the revival of religion from becoming the formation of a sect.'

The Rev. Harry Drew, late Rector of Hawarden, once delivered a series of Advent Addresses on death and preparation for death. The addresses were so good and so characteristic that they have been republished in, and have given the title to, a volume of selected sermons which has been edited by Mr. G. C. Joyce, Warden of S. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden. The title of the volume is *Death and the Hereafter* (Frowde; 2s. 6d. net).

There is a movement on behalf of ethical education that is quite innocent of any desire to supplant religion. Its purpose is simply to enable the teacher to understand that the aim of education ought always to be the formation of character. Many manuals of instruction are in existence; but for thoroughness of treatment and rightness of tone we have seen nothing to be compared with *The Teacher's Practical Philosophy*, by George Trumbull Ladd, D.D., LL.D. (Funk & Wagnalls; 5s. net). Dr. Ladd deliberately prepared himself for writing the book by travel, not only throughout America, but also in Britain, Japan, Korea, and Hawaii, and by visiting seminaries and talking to teachers wherever he went. It is a considerable book to read through, and teachers have little time to spare; but it has been written and rewritten, so that now no time will be wasted in spelling out the meaning of it.

The unpardonable sin of the American pulpit is dulness, and very few of the American preachers are guilty of it. The risk they run is in the opposite direction. It is therefore a relief to find a preacher like the Rev. P. S. Henson, D.D., LL.D., who is not afraid to offer his people good solid exposition, with a leavening of anecdote but no sensationalism. The first four sermons in his book are on the four faces of Ezekiel's vision, and so the book is called *The Four Faces* (Philadelphia: Griffith & Rowland; \$1 net).



Mr. Martin Haile and Mr. Edwin Bonney have together prepared and produced the *Life and Letters of John Lingard* (Herbert & Daniel; 12s. 6d. net). It was time for this to be done. Lingard died in 1851—sixty years ago. One of the gentlest of men, he lived in a perpetual torrent of controversy, and apparently it has hitherto been considered impossible to tell the story of his life with any frankness. But now the controversy is dead, and even most of the controversialists, and the story of Lingard's life has been told with both fulness and frankness.

The book is more than a biography. It is a history of the English Catholics for the first half of the last century. Lingard is sometimes forgotten for long spaces together. But all that belongs to the authors' purpose. Lingard was part, and no small part, of the times in which he lived. To know him intimately we must know these times well.

Lingard's name lives with his *History of England*. That History, fiercely attacked on its publication by his fellow Roman Catholics because it was too Protestant, and almost as fiercely by Protestant journalists because it was too Roman Catholic, is now admitted to be for its time almost a miracle of impartiality. Lingard's estimate of Thomas of Canterbury, for example—he admits having called him 'saint' once and almost regrets it—is now accepted by history. If Lingard had only cultivated a little grace of style (he says he had not time for it, so occupied was he with research), the History would have remained until this day.

But no one will be disappointed with the biography. It is well written and worth reading; and the publishers have enriched it with four beautiful photogravures and the facsimile of a letter.

'I had your short note, the shortest on record, yesterday. I think you are in low spirits, so I am writing this wee "sursum corda." You are probably working above your strength. Please remember that when we give what we have, the Lord makes it enough. He did not bid His disciples bake more loaves: would not even let them go to the villages for more. It is the blessing, not the amount of work, that tells. I always think the sower might have saved the seed that he wasted on the wayside and the shallow

ground. He was in too big a hurry. I have always been a waster, so am now serving as a beacon to you, dear Highland maid. How fine and dear your father's salutation, "My wee seagull."

This letter occurs in the life of *Lady Victoria Campbell*, which has been written by Lady Frances Balfour (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). It is an illustration of 'Don't do as I do, but do as I bid you do.' For Lady Victoria Campbell always worked above her strength. No cause that needed help, and even no person, was forgotten. At first you think of her as though she were the lady of the Song of Solomon, who cultivated every one's garden except her own. But you are arrested with amazement and shame. This woman was a saint.

Few are the men who would have dared to write a book with so comprehensive a title as *The Intellectual Development of Scotland* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). Mr. Hector Macpherson could dare and do it. He has himself had some hand in the development. He has been for many years in the heart of it, and he is both an observer and a writer. He is a writer, we say. You can do nothing with a subject of this kind unless you have a style to carry it off. In case there is nothing to remember afterwards there must be something to enjoy for the moment.

Need we say that no Scotsman will agree with him entirely? No Scotsman agrees with any other entirely on anything. The inevitable criticism is that Mr. Macpherson stands outside some of the movements, and stands outside deliberately. Why should a man, and a Scotsman, who knows what the Church has done for Scotland, write as if he were not a Churchman? No doubt Mr. Macpherson writes also as if he were not a man of science. But he does not of set purpose stand outside the scientific circle. Sometimes his distance seems to give him an advantage, as in the discussion on the dilemma of the modern Church about authority. But the advantage is lost the moment it is felt that the dilemma is exaggerated. What is the difficulty about authority? That the Bible has lost it? Not so. The Bible has educated a Christian conscience which returns to read the Bible and find it as authoritative as ever, though the authority is less external.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have published a new edition (1s. net) of *The Higher Criticism*, four papers written by Professor Driver and Dean Kirkpatrick. To be more accurate, they have published the three papers of the original edition, and added a fourth by Dr. Kirkpatrick. The new edition has also a new preface, which is signed by Dr. Driver, and which explains clearly, and surely once for all now, what the phrase 'Higher Criticism' means.

The power of the pulpit to-day is with the man who has a message and can deliver it in few words. The Rev. J. R. P. Sclater, M.A., minister of the New North Church in Edinburgh, draws young men to his church in great numbers every Sunday evening. For every Sunday evening he has a direct and distinct message for them, and he loses no time in delivering it. Fifty-two of these addresses have been published under the title of *The Enterprise of Life* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net). It would be wrong to say that they lose nothing by being read instead of being heard. But Mr. Sclater has a personality that cannot be killed even by the printed page. The reader has even, in one respect, an advantage over the hearer. He can read the addresses that bear upon the same topic at a sitting and thus feel the accumulating force of their argument more intensely than if he had to wait a week between them.

Messrs. Longmans have published a translation of Mgr. Batiffol's famous reply to Reinach's famous 'Orpheus.' Reinach's 'Orpheus' made a great impression in France, something very like a consternation. Its audacious assumption of superior knowledge, as if all the things that had ever been hidden from the wise and prudent were at last revealed unto this babe, frightened the French theologians almost out of their wits. So Batiffol delivered a series of lectures in answer to 'Orpheus,' and then published them under the title of "'Orpheus" et l'Evangile.' They have now been translated into English by the Rev. G. C. H. Pollen, S.J., and published under the title of *The Credibility of the Gospel* (4s. 6d. net).

Batiffol simply annihilates Reinach. Reinach's superior knowledge—that is to say, in the criticism of the Gospels—is superior and incredible ignorance. But Batiffol does more than that. He makes contributions to the study of Christian

origins which are of independent and very considerable value. Thus the volume as it appears in this excellent English translation serves three good ends. It adds to our knowledge of early Christian literature, it provides a useful manual of Christian apologetic, and it repeats with emphasis the valuable advice which is so often forgotten, 'Ne sutor ultra crepidam.'

The Bishop of Down, Dr. D'Arcy, has contributed a volume to the 'Anglican Church Handbooks' on *Christian Ethics and Modern Thought* (Longmans; 1s. net). Into the book is condensed the matter that might have been given in a large octavo. Two things seem to Bishop D'Arcy to need most emphasis—first, that Christian Ethics come from within and therefore must be individual; next, that individual Ethics are nothing if they do not become social.

The President of Oberlin College has written many books, and has gathered confidence. Now he undertakes to survey the whole field of religious thought and experience. In a volume with the title, *The Moral and Religious Challenge of our Times* (Macmillan; 6s. 6d. net), Dr. King causes the whole world of ethical and religious life to pass before him, pronounces judgments, suggests remedies, and finds the one guiding principle which shall heal divisions and lift burdens. That principle is reverence for personality. By that principle he tests individuals and nations. As they attain to it they fulfil their being, as they fall short of it they fail. For the principle of reverence for personality is 'the key for man's discernment of himself, for the interpretation of history, and for the understanding of God in all His relations to men.' So we may say that the most modern rendering of the chief commandment is, 'Thou shalt reverence the Person of the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and thou shalt reverence the person of thy neighbour as thine own person.'

Dr. King did not make his book in order to fit this key. He had written his book before the key was found. And so we have the most interesting phenomenon of a book written under a quite unconscious spiritual influence, which is seen with trembling joy only when the book is finished.

Messrs. Macniven & Wallace have published



for the Church Worship Association, in connexion with the United Free Church of Scotland, a *Manual for Visitation of the Sick*. It is a charming book to handle, but yet more charming and precious within. It is the fruit of both prayer and pains, and a blessing will follow it.

Nearly thirty years ago—it was in the year 1884—Mr. F. E. Marsh published a book called *Emblems of the Holy Spirit*. He did not exhaust the emblems. He noticed only the emblems of Oil, Water, Dew, Wind, the Seal, the Earnest, and the Dove. And he let the book run out of print. He has now completed the emblems and published the whole in a handsome volume with the same title (Morgan & Scott; 3s. 6d. net). Incredibly futile as much evangelical writing on the Holy Spirit has been, this is a book of substance and worth.

Messrs. Morgan & Scott have also published a collection of lectures and addresses on the Jews from the writings of Dr. Adolph Saphir. The title is *Christ and Israel* (3s. 6d. net). And they have issued a small but notable volume of sermons by the Rev. A. B. Simpson, D.D., under the title of *The Christ Life* (1s. 6d. net).

The value of a volume of sermons is in its suggestiveness. A volume of sermons by the late Dr. Collins, Bishop of Gibraltar, has been published with the title *Hours of Insight* (Murray; 3s. 6d. net). Take the sermon on this text: 'The servants which drew the water knew' (Jn 2<sup>9</sup>). It is an exposition of the whole text, indeed of the whole parable. But two things create new thought. There is a new exposition of the word 'kept,' and there is a wonderful application of the fact that the servants knew.

The Rev. J. R. Cohu is an amazingly prolific writer. We could not get past him for a season, if we would. But we welcome him. For his study is always conscientious and his own, whatever the subject may be. This time it is evolution. His book on evolution is worth reading, however much we have read on that subject already. His topic is not evolution and genesis, but evolution and God; and that is the vital topic. The title is *Through Evolution to the Living God* (Parker; 3s. 6d. net).

It is not long since President Taft returned from unveiling a monument at Provincetown, Mass., to the Pilgrim Fathers. But there are other monuments than those in stone. British publishers—Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons—have issued a volume which is not less beautiful in workmanship, and may last longer. It contains no fewer than forty-eight full-page illustrations. Each illustration is printed in brown on separate paper and enclosed in a light green border. The same border runs round the pages of letterpress. The author of the book is Mr. A. C. Addison, who explains that his object is to give the reader an account of the *Mayflower* pilgrims which is concise and yet sufficiently comprehensive to embrace all essentials respecting the personality and pilgrimage of the Fathers whom Whittier pictures to us as:

those brave men who brought  
To the ice and iron of our winter time  
A will as firm, a creed as stern, and wrought  
With one mailed hand and with the other  
fought.

The title of the book is *The Romantic Story of the Mayflower Pilgrims, and its Place in the Life of To-day* (7s. 6d. net).

Mr. J. Arthur Hill's *Religion and Modern Psychology* (Rider; 3s. 6d. net) is not a book of hard scientific fact, but it gives us the best survey we have yet had, short and intelligible, of what has been accomplished by psychical research. Mr. Hill thinks that the survival of the individual after death has been proved, and that the proof has come through our bodily sensations. But he is not by any means dogmatic about it. All he says is that 'things certainly happen which recognized scientific theories will not cover, and some of these happenings are best explained by the hypothesis of the continued existence and agency of disembodied minds.' Has psychical research told us anything of the life which 'disembodied minds' live? He thinks it has. It is a life of latitudinarianism. It is 'an emphatic protest against theological bigotry and dogmatism of all kinds.' Again, 'there is no sudden unalloyed bliss for the good.' The bad go on trying to be not so bad, and the good try to be better. Nor is there any immediate access of happiness, though the disembodied mind hopes

that that will come. In the other world as in this, according to psychical research,

Man never is but always to be blest.

In short, according to psychical research, there is nothing new over the sun any more than under it.

*Falling Upwards* is the title (within quotation marks) which the Rev. F. W. Orde Ward, B.A., Oxford, has given to his new book (Simpkin; 5s. net). It is a phrase of consummate cleverness, and used quite legitimately by Leibniz. But it has come to grief of late. 'Falling upwards,' as a description of sin, is a moral outrage which the conscience of even the hardest sinner will not accept. But Mr. Orde Ward is no latitudinarian. With a skill in paradox which Mr. Chesterton himself would not always surpass, he is a sound theologian. Listen to what he says about perfection. 'But what do we mean by Perfection? The apparent paradox, but profound truth, that the impossible is the only possible aim for man. "If it be impossible, it shall be done." Christ does not enlist us in His service simply to fight the difficulties or overcome hardships, or even to die daily, as all must do who grow spiritually, because these are comparatively easy tasks. No, but He bids us repent and believe and love, and make others' causes our own and live in them and for them—which we can no more do by nature than we can fly without aeroplanes. He provides us with a new moral centre of gravity, namely, the Cross. To be perfect, then, is to have reached an end. And in our case, it means the acceptance of His law. We can be perfect now potentially—complete in Him. Practically we are not and never shall be on earth. But then Christ accepts the will for the deed, the good intention for the fact, the promise for the performance, the ideal for the real and actual. His accomplishment is made over to us, and we rest in His finished work.'

The fifty-fifth volume of *Great Thoughts from Master Minds* (Smith's Pub. Co.) is the first volume of the seventh series. The editor in his preface quotes Charles Reade, who said that he was 'a setter of diamonds.' The editor has sought to be a setter of diamonds also. There is just one thing that would make the book more valuable. It is that the editor would tell us exactly whence he has taken his quotations.

Read books, not books about books. With one exception. Read *Bookland* (Elliot Stock; 2s. 6d. net), by Miss Grace Lambert, though it is a book about books. For it is itself a book.

Is there any great writer of our day of whose personality and doctrine the impression is more indefinite than Tolstoy? His books are a vast cathedral. We need a guide to interpret the several parts and to point out the unity that they lead to. The Rev. Alexander H. Craufurd, M.A., has constituted himself our guide. Already successful as an interpreter of James Martineau and H. G. Wells, he has been encouraged to undertake this mightier task. If we do not understand Tolstoy after reading Mr. Craufurd's book, it must be because Tolstoy is unintelligible. For Mr. Craufurd has manifestly studied him through and through, and writes with most refreshing clearness. Perhaps it is only another Tolstoy that could understand Tolstoy utterly. Mr. Craufurd, though sympathetic, does not believe that Tolstoy's system is consistent, and he does not believe that it would be workable if it were. Is it possible that Mr. Craufurd takes too short a view? Tolstoy's vision is always of the land of far distances. The title of the book is *The Religion and Ethics of Tolstoy* (Fisher Unwin; 3s. 6d. net).

*Christ and Human Need* is the title of a volume of addresses delivered at a Conference on Foreign Missions and Social Problems at Liverpool in January 1912. Mr. Harry Bisseker has an address in it on 'Social Facts and Spiritual Issues,' and Professor Cairns has one on 'Coming Religious Changes in the Far East' (Student Volunteer Missionary Union; 2s. net).

The editor of the *Hibbert Journal*, whatever may be said of him as an editor, claims and deserves the reputation of an author. Men may ask what the *Hibbert Journal* stands for; they are in no doubt as to what Mr. Jacks means in his essays. His theology is the theology of Faber:

There's a wideness in God's mercy  
Like the wideness of the sea.

And every paper, whatever its form, reads the attractive lesson that it is not possible for any one to pass beyond the sweep of God's white raiment.



Now such a creed as a protest against a narrow orthodoxy is both beautiful and inevitable. We read Faber and reverence him. But is not the orthodoxy of the present day wide enough? Are we not now in imminent danger of approaching God indifferently and indiscriminately, as we might approach a benevolent old gentleman who is too indulgent to see that we are to blame and too soft-hearted to blame us if he saw? The prodigal goes out into the far country and spends his substance

in riotous living. Mr. Jacks seems to say that it scarcely matters. Does he think it matters at all when the end comes? But Jesus said, 'This my son was dead.' The prodigal had to return, saying 'Father, I have sinned,' before the Father could say, 'and is alive again.' In the scenes of Mr. Jacks's new book *Among the Idolmakers* (Williams & Norgate; 5s. net) there is human error enough. Is God really looking on all the while so complacently?

## The Archaeology of the Book of Genesis.

BY THE REV. A. H. SAYCE, D.D., LL.D., D.LITT., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY, OXFORD.

### Chapter vi.

9, 10. Here we have another extract from the book of generations, or series of tablets called *annâti talidât*. It would seem to have been the third tablet of the series, which followed 5<sup>31</sup>, to which v.<sup>32</sup> has been appended by the Hebrew writer. Consequently the words, 'these are the generations,' will have been derived from the colophon of the tablet: *duppu III; Annâti talidât*, '3rd tablet of *Annâti talidât*,' and the extract would not necessarily contain a list of Noah's generations or descendants. And this, in fact, is the case. There are no generations of Noah, only the one generation of his three sons; cf. 25<sup>19</sup>. Hence the original would have been: 'And Noah lived (500?) years, and begat three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth. And Noah walked with God after he had begotten his sons, 450 (?) years (and begat sons and daughters). And all the days of Noah were 950 years: and he died.' The last sentence has been transferred to 9<sup>29</sup>. That Noah should be said to have 'walked with God,' like Enoch, is explained by the fact that, according to the Babylonian version, it was Utu-napistim, and not Enwe-dhuranki, who was translated to live 'among the gods'; see note on 5<sup>24</sup>. Perhaps, therefore, the original had, instead of 'he died,' 'he was not, for God took him.' In any case, the repetition of the name Noah and the want of the copulative conjunction raises the presumption that the words, 'Noah was a just man, perfect in his generations,' were a marginal note which has made

its way into the text. *Zaddiq*, 'righteous,' is the Ass. *isaru*, but as a title of the hero of the Deluge it replaces *atra-khasis*, 'the very wise,' in the Deluge story. While, according to the Babylonian story, it was the wisdom of Utu-napistim which made Ea, the god of wisdom, reveal to him the coming catastrophe, Yahweh's revelation to Noah was due to the latter's righteousness. Once more there is an intentional correction of the Babylonian version on the part of the Hebrew writer. Yahweh demanded not only wisdom, but also righteousness; Babylonian polytheism divided the divine attributes among different gods. 'A righteous man' and 'he was upright in his generations' are alternative renderings of the Ass. *isaru ina amelûti*, 'upright among men.' The Septuagint corrects, 'in his generation'; but the correction is needless, since the patriarch or hero lived through several generations of ordinary men.

II. The Assyrian would be *irtsitu limnit* (or *sukkkhupat*) *lapâni ilâni*; *irtsitu mikhtsi* (or *limutti*) *malat*. The earth had been pronounced good (10<sup>31</sup>), but murder had brought upon it a curse, the Babylonian *arrat limuttim*, also called *qûlu lâ dhâbu*, 'voice of evil' (as in 4<sup>10-12</sup>). Hence, like the animals, it was to share in the punishment of the Deluge. Here, again, there is an implicit condemnation of Babylonian polytheism, which made the earth a goddess, whose name, *Irtsitu*, is compounded with those of Western Semites in the Khammu-rabi period. In the Epic of Gilgames the

Earth is put on a level with Namtaru, 'Destiny,' and regarded as 'taking' mankind from life. The Hebrew writer, on the other hand, degrades Earth, the goddess who inflicts death, to 'the earth' which shares in the corruption, and consequently in the punishment, of the men who inhabit it. Like Tiamât, it becomes the enemy of the deity (*limnit lapâni ilâni*), full of 'violence,' like the forces of Tiamât. The passage seems to be taken from a poem, since its Assyrian equivalent is in the form of a verse.

12. This verse is a commentary on the preceding one. When God sees the earth (*irtsitam inadhdhal* in Assyrian), it has become corrupt, because the living beings upon it—who were formed of its dust, and returned at death to its bosom—were corrupt and hostile to God. In the Epic of Gilgames, 'the law of the Earth' (*urtim irtsitim*) is declared to be that mortal man is formed from the dust, and shall 'sink back' into it (*ina epiri ittapalsikh*). In v.<sup>8</sup> man had already been pronounced to be 'flesh,' and in v.<sup>7</sup> the lower animals had been stated to be involved in the judgment that was coming upon man. Just as v.<sup>7</sup> refers us to 1<sup>28</sup>, so this verse refers us to 2<sup>7</sup>.

13. The earth had become corrupt and ruined, so God will now ruin it. The play on the Hebrew word reproduces the Assyrian *irtsitam ulammenu*, 'I will destroy the earth,' where there is the same play on *limnit* and *ulammenu*, though perhaps the original text had *askhup*, 'I will destroy,' since *sikhiptu*, 'the destruction,' is given as a synonym of *bubbulu*, 'the deluge' (see note on 6<sup>17</sup>). In the Babylonian story of the Deluge, however, the word actually used is *khulluq* (*ana khulluq nisi-ya*, 'to destroy my men'). The Hebrew text has 'I will destroy them, (namely) the earth,' where the Septuagint has endeavoured to make sense by inserting 'and' after 'them.' 'The earth,' however, must be a marginal gloss, derived from the Babylonian original; the Hebrew writer was explaining that the reference to 'the earth' meant the living creatures upon it. Hence we may conclude that, in the original tablet, v.<sup>11</sup> (or 12<sup>a</sup>) was followed by v.<sup>13</sup>, which ran: 'And God said unto Noah: The fated period of all flesh is come before me, and behold, I will destroy the earth.' The explanation of what was meant by the earth obliged the Hebrew scribe to substitute 'them' for 'the earth' at the end of the verse.

The Septuagint is right in reading *καρπὸς*, 'period,'

for 'end.' The Babylonian original had *adannu*, as in the story of the Deluge (l. 87), *adanna Samas iskunamma*, 'the fated period did the Sun-god fix,' and (l. 90) *adannu sù iktalda*, 'that fated period arrived,' and would have been *adannu sa kullat nisi ana mukhkhî-ya issakin*.

14. In the Babylonian story of the Deluge the command of Ea to Utu-napistim is: 'Fashion a house, build a ship,' and in the account of its construction it is said to have been divided into nine rooms, and to have been pitched within and without. The Heb. *kopher*, 'pitch,' is borrowed from the Babylonian *kupru*. The stoneless plain of Babylonia was the first home of building with brick, and the bitumen springs at Hit and on the eastern side of the Tigris supplied the builders with mortar.

*Bayit*, 'within,' answers to the *bitu*, 'house,' of Ea's command. Later on in the Babylonian story, the Chaldaean ship is called an *ekallu*, or 'palace.' The wood of which it was built is not stated in the Babylonian account. What is meant by 'gopherwood' is unknown; the Septuagint translates, 'square logs.' In an Assyrian lexical tablet (K 169) mention is made of the tree *kuptarru*, which is said to be also called *kaptaru*, reminding us of Caphtor, the Hebrew name of Krete. Both *gubru* and *kapru* mean a 'plate' or 'table.'

The 'ark' (*têbâh*), which replaces the Babylonian 'ship,' is Palestinian, Palestine being a country without navigable rivers (cf. note on 1<sup>11</sup>). Similarly, the members of Osiris were said to have come to Byblos (Gabal) in a chest. The word *têbâh* seems to have been borrowed from the Egyptian *deb*, *teb*, or *tebt*, 'a chest.'

15. Ea's instructions to Utu-napistim were—

The ship which thou buildest, even thou,  
let its size be so planned  
that its breadth and its length be proportionate,

where *mitkhur* ('proportionate') probably means that the length and breadth should be the same, like those of the modern *kufa*, which is used on the Tigris and Euphrates; but it may signify only that their proportions were similar.

In the account of the building of the ship we read:

According to the plan, 120 cubits high were its sides,  
120 cubits was the width of its roof.  
I planked its side and closed it in;  
I completed it in 6 storeys (?);  
I divided its . . . into 7 parts;



its interior did I divide into 9 rooms;  
 a mast (?) in the middle of it I planted;  
 I looked to the rudder and added what was wanting;  
 6 *sari* of pitch I poured over the hull;  
 3 *sari* of bitumen [I poured] over the interior.

The Hebrew ark needed, of course, no mast or rudder. The proportions of a chest, moreover, were necessarily not the same as those of a ship. Hence, in passing from Babylonia to Palestine, the account of the size of the vessel underwent alteration. Its length and breadth were no longer proportionate, the length being half a *ner* of cubits, and the breadth fifty cubits, a measurement which is no longer Babylonian, but Egypto-Palestinian. When the measurement of the breadth was changed in order to make the Hebrew ark conformable to the shape of a chest or Egyptian box, the number of cubits in which it was expressed ceased to be Babylonian, and became Egyptian. The height remained the Babylonian measure of half a *soš* of cubits, a fourth part of the height of the Babylonian ship. Perhaps, therefore, the reduction in the length of the vessel was the same; in this case, the ship of Utu-napistim would have been 1200 cubits long, but it was more probably 300. The Heb. word *ammâh*, 'cubit,' like the measure it denoted, was borrowed from Babylonia.

16. The *paseq* attached to *zohar*, A.V. 'window,' shows that the meaning of the word was doubtful to the Massoretes. The Septuagint translators were equally puzzled by it, and their rendering, *ἐπισυνάγων*, 'narrowing,' seems to indicate that they corrected it into *zâ'ir*. Professor Jensen has pointed out that it is the *tsuhru* and *tsukhru* of the Tel el-Amarna tablets, which in Winckler (157. 11) is given as the Canaanite equivalent of the Ass. *tsiru*, 'back.' Hence the word will signify the back-like roof of the ark, which, like that of most Egyptian chests, resembled the roof of an English house. The Babylonian vessel also had a 'roof.'

What is meant by the phrase 'thou shalt finish it (the ark) above at a cubit' is not clear. Perhaps it is a translation of the common Assyrian expression: 'so many cubits' *ina i. ammati*, 'according to a cubit-measure'; literally, 'in a cubit.' If so, the phrase would signify that no fractions of the cubit were to be used, but that the dimensions of the ark when completed should represent accurately aggregates of cubits only. In any case the ark, it would seem, was to be built from the bottom upwards.

The Babylonian vessel also had a door which Utu-napistim closed when he entered it. On the other hand, the six storeys of the Babylonian account are halved in the case of the Hebrew ark in accordance with its otherwise reduced dimensions. These reduced dimensions, it may be noticed, correspond with the reduced number of years assigned in Genesis to the antediluvian patriarchs when compared with the antediluvian kings of Babylonia.

17. Once more the Hebrew writer emphasizes the fact that the Deluge was brought upon the earth by the same God as He who revealed its approach to Noah. Once more, therefore, there is a silent condemnation of Babylonian polytheism. The Heb. text has 'the flood of waters,' indicating that it was a well-known event. Zimmern is doubtless right in holding that *mabbûl*, 'flood,' is borrowed from the Ass. *bubbûlu*, which is given as a synonym of *abubu*, 'the deluge,' as well as of *sikhiptu*, 'destruction,' the equivalent of the Heb. שִׁחָה. Both the word and the event would have been well known in pre-mosaic Canaan where Babylonian literature was studied and the Babylonian language and script learnt in the schools. For 'waters,' see note on 7<sup>6</sup>.

'All flesh wherein is the breath of life,' answers to *zîr napsâti kalama*, 'the seed of life of every kind,' in the Babylonian version, the variation in the words being due to the reference to 1<sup>7</sup> 6<sup>3</sup>.<sup>12</sup> But the sense is the same; hence 'the breath of life' is not restricted to man as in 1<sup>7</sup> 6<sup>3</sup>, but includes the animal creation as in 6<sup>7</sup>.<sup>1</sup> 'Everything which is in the land,' not 'earth,' since the destruction did not extend to the vegetable creation. The olive was still in leaf when the waters abated.

18. Here, as in Gn 1, there is an implicit contradiction of the polytheistic Babylonian story. The 'covenant' which was made after the descent from the ark and Noah's sacrifice to Yahweh (9<sup>9-17</sup>) corresponds with the covenant made under the same circumstances between Ellil (Bel) and Utu-napistim. It was Ellil who had sent the Deluge and with whom the covenant with Utu-napistim was finally made. But it was not Ellil who had warned Utu-napistim of the approaching

<sup>1</sup> The expression 'breath of life' seems to have been specially Canaanite, like the use of the plural *ilâni* for the singular *ilu*, 'god,' since the Tel el-Amarna writers address the Pharaoh as *sari napisti-ya*, 'the breath of my life.'

catastrophe and told him to build the ark, but Ea, whose intercession alone saved the Chaldæan hero from destruction and made the covenant possible. The Hebrew writer, however, here emphasizes the fact not only that the author of the Deluge and the preserver of Noah were the same, but also that in bidding him build the ark this one God declared at the same time that He would make a covenant with him. The polytheism of the Babylonian story is thus tacitly denied.

17-22. This passage is a variant of 7<sup>1-6</sup>. In the Assyro-Babylonian Epic of the Creation long passages are similarly repeated at different moments of the story, and the same characteristic recurs in other Babylonian legends. We may, therefore, have here a reproduction of Babylonian literary usage. But, on the other hand, we may have variant free renderings of the same cuneiform original, just as elsewhere we have alternative renderings, side by side, of the same Babylonian word (e.g. Gn 4<sup>22</sup>). In favour of this are the words with which both passages conclude (6<sup>22</sup> 7<sup>5</sup>), as well as the fact that a little further on 7<sup>7-10, 13-17</sup>) we find another duplicate pas-

sage which can best be explained as due to variant translations. Against this explanation is the dislocation of 6<sup>17</sup> when compared with 7<sup>4</sup>. In any case the entrance of Noah into the ark is regarded in the two passages from different points of view: while 7<sup>1-5</sup> refers us to the Mosaic Law with its division of animals into the clean and unclean, 6<sup>17-22</sup> takes us back to Gn 1.

The variations in the order of the words—'thou shalt come into the ark, thou and thy' family, 'come thou and all thy house into the ark,' etc.—are instructive, and throw light upon the method of translation from Babylonian or Israelitish cuneiform texts. So, too, are the paraphrastic explanations of words or expressions, 'all thy house,' for example, being resolved into 'thy sons, and thy wives, and the wives of thy sons.' The Babylonian Epic has simply 'my family, and my wives.' But it adds to these the 'craftsmen' who had constructed the ark; to the Hebrew writer Cain, the Smith, belonged to the accursed race whom it was the object of the Deluge to destroy. Hence the family of Noah alone was admitted into the Hebrew ark; nor did it need a steersman like the Babylonian vessel.

## Recent Foreign Theology.

### Two Important Works by Professor König.<sup>1</sup>

1. A NEW Hebrew Lexicon by so competent a Hebraist as Dr. König will be very welcome to O.T. scholars and students. It will supersede the admirable work of Siegfried-Stade, which is now somewhat out of date, and which had the very serious defect of almost entirely omitting the etymological element which is so important. It will appeal to many who cannot afford to procure the great *Oxford Heb. Lexicon*, and even those who possess the latter will thankfully give Professor König's work a place alongside it. To a very large class of students a welcome feature of

the new Lexicon will be the fact that the Heb. words are dealt with alphabetically and not etymologically, as in the *Oxford Lexicon*. This will save much time to those who consult its pages. Moreover, any forms that are difficult to recognize are analyzed in their alphabetical place, and the Massoretical notes are explained. The thoroughness and up-to-date character of the work are illustrated by the fact that the Aramaic part of the Lexicon contains not only the words found in the O.T. but all the most important terms that occur in the recently discovered texts of Assuan and Elephantine. Special attention is bestowed on the development in meaning of Heb. words, and copious references are made to the usage in the cognate languages. The Assyriological and other literary data are fully given, and the author is not content, as too many are, simply to cite an authority, but is careful to indicate what that authority contains. Alike for its practical use and for its scientific value, which is of the highest, Professor König's Lexicon merits the warmest commendation.

<sup>1</sup> (1) *Heb. und aram. Wörterbuch zum A.T.; mit Einschaltung u. Analyse aller schwer erkennbaren Formen, Deutung der Eigennamen sowie der massor. Randbemerkungen, u. einem deutsch-heb. Wortregister.* Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. Price M.11.

(2) *Gesch. der Alttest. Religion kritisch dargestellt.* Gütersloh: Druck u. Verlag von C. Bertelsmann. Price M.7, bound M.8.



2. The Religion of Israel is a subject of perennial interest, and, in spite of all that has been written upon it, any fresh contribution to its elucidation is welcome. In the work before us Professor König has gathered up the results of many years of careful and patient study. His standpoint, which is that of a progressive, yet sane and cautious, criticism, is sufficiently familiar to readers of his previous works, who will be thankful to have so competent a guide to lead them through the labyrinth of modern theories of the origin and development of the O.T. religion. Nowadays we have not only the 'traditional' and the 'critical' theory, but a modified traditionalism represented in our own country by Professor Orr, and a variety of theories difficult to classify, like those of Sayce, and Hommel, and Gunkel, not to speak of the more recent hypotheses—some of them revolutionary enough—of men like Jahn and Eerdmans and Drews. We have to deal also with those who discover astral myths at every turn—chiefly Winckler and A. Jeremias—and with such a champion of Panbabylonism as Friedrich Delitzsch. All these theories are sufficiently examined in the volume before us. The author follows the convenient plan of giving his own views in paragraphs printed in ordinary type, while other views, whether agreeing with or diverging from them, are dealt with in paragraphs that are interspersed in smaller type. The reader may thus, if he cares to do so, first go consecutively through Dr. König's own views, and then return and examine the evidence for himself. It is scarcely necessary to say that the author is scrupulously fair to his opponents, avoiding entirely those personalities that so often disfigure the pages even of scientific works. His object is simply to place at the disposal of his readers the evidence in full, and, while stating clearly his own views, to enable them to form conclusions for themselves. It would not be fair, even if it were possible within our limits of space, to summarize the conclusions of Professor König, but we may indicate the general plan of the work, in the assurance that readers will be induced to turn their attention to it.

The book falls into two main divisions, the first of which (pp. 26-118) is entitled 'Der Ursprung der Religion Israels,' and contains four chapters. Of these the third and fourth, entitled respectively 'Fragliche Vorstufen der israel. Religion' and 'Die positiven Fermente u. Triebkräfte beim Ursprung

der legitimen Rel. Israels' are of special importance. Here we find full discussions of such subjects as Totemism, Ancestor-worship, Fetishism, the alleged monotheism of the Semites in general, henotheism, etc. The second main division, which forms much the larger part of the book (pp. 119-579), includes also four chapters. It is entitled 'Die Entfaltung der Religion Israels.' The first chapter is one of much interest, dealing as it does with the 'patriarchal' stage of O.T. religion. The question of the historical existence of the patriarchs is very carefully examined. In this section we are very glad to see the 'polytheistic' notions of Eerdmans rejected for reasons that are thoroughly convincing. In chapter vi. full justice is done to the personality and work of Moses. Here we have most valuable discussions, for instance, of the meaning of the name *Jahweh*, and the Kenite and other theories of the origin of Jahweh-worship. Chapter vii. brings us to the era of the writing prophets. Of special importance here are the treatment of 'ethical monotheism,' the discussion of Josiah's reformation and the part played therein by the Book of Deuteronomy, and the illuminating characterization of the special mission of Jeremiah. The concluding chapter introduces us to the period of the Scribes, and exhibits the prominence given to the Law, the part played by the Wisdom literature, and the significance of the Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, etc. The value of Professor König's volume is materially enhanced by two excellent indexes—one of subjects, the other of Scripture and other texts cited.

J. A. SELBIE.

Aberdeen.

### Valentinianism.<sup>1</sup>

THIS volume, which appears as Part xxxvii. 3 of the well-known *Texte und Untersuchungen*, is a fresh discussion of the subject dealt with by G. Heinrici in his important monograph, *Die Valentinianische Gnosis u. die Heilige Schrift*, published forty years ago. The critical investigation of the sources carried on since then by Lipsius, Zahn, Von Arnim, and others, together with the immense increase of knowledge regarding those factors which created the highly syncretistic movement designated as Gnosticism, have certainly paved the

<sup>1</sup> *Die Interpretation des Neuen Testaments in der Valentinianischen Gnosis.* Von Lic. C. Barth. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1911. Pp. iv, 118. Price M.4.

way for a new examination of Valentinian exegesis. The result is a compact, scholarly, informing dissertation.

The author does not profess to make any original contribution to source-criticism. But he gives a concise and interesting survey of the more probable results. For probability is all that can be attained in this perplexing field of research. One of the more important hypotheses which he seeks to establish is that of the large dependence of Irenæus, our chief patristic authority for Valentinian Gnosticism, on a work of Ptolemæus, the leading teacher of the Western Valentinian school (pp. 12-21). In this direction he goes much further, *e.g.*, than Lipsius.

Barth leads up to the subject proper by an examination of New Testament quotations in the surviving fragments of Valentinian documents. Here the problem is complicated owing to the difficulty of determining whether Clement, Irenæus, and Hippolytus have altered Valentinian readings in the material which they alone have preserved. In any case, many of the quotations exhibit readings obviously typical of the school: *e.g.* Ro 8<sup>20</sup> (*Excerpt*. 49<sup>1</sup>), ὑπετάγη τῇ ματαιότητι τοῦ κόσμου οὐχ ἑκῶν, ἀλλὰ κ.τ.λ., where ἑκοῦσα is changed to masculine ἑκῶν and referred to the Demiurge, and κτίσις omitted as synonymous with him. Yet these alterations are insignificant as compared with the mutilations made by Marcion.

The main content of the discussion is to be found in chap. vi. ('Soteriological Interpretation of the Redemptive Facts of the Life of Jesus') and chap. vii. ('Allegorical Interpretation of Scripture'). These chapters might quite well have been thrown together as their material overlaps. The interpretation of the earthly life of Jesus is characteristic of the Valentinian standpoint. Valentinus had shaped his system with far closer affinities to Platonism than to the Oriental Dualism which lay at the basis of the vulgar Gnosticism. Hence the career of Jesus is merely the visible representation of great metaphysical processes. Thus, *e.g.*, the star of Bethlehem is not a mere light to guide the Magi. As it shines in the heavens, it is the higher aspect of the Saviour who is born on earth. As a redemptive agency, it crushes the power of the star-spirits to whose rule (εἰμαρμένη) men were subject (pp. 46-47). Barth gives some good illustrations of this phase of belief from contemporary literature, but these notes would have gained by

a more orderly arrangement of material. It is exceedingly doubtful whether star-spirits can be found in Ro 8<sup>38</sup> (p. 48, n. 2).

It was, of course, inevitable that exegetes with the pre-suppositions of the Valentinian school should apply the allegorical method. According to a highly probable tradition, Valentinus had been brought up in Egypt, one of the chief centres of allegorical interpretation. Hence the method is adopted in passages which seem to lower the dignity of the Saviour (*e.g.* Lk 9<sup>22</sup>), which contain difficult expressions (*e.g.* 1 Co 11<sup>10</sup>), which contradict other parts of Scripture (*e.g.* Jn 1<sup>28f.</sup>), or whose language suggests Valentinian conceptions (*e.g.*, the use of σοφία). The key to this science of interpretation is to be found in Gnosis. And we may note, in passing, a very remarkable description of the contents of Gnosis found in *Excerpt*. 78 (cited by Barth): ἡ γνώσις, τίνες ἦμεν, τί γεγόναμεν· ποῦ ἦμεν [ἡ] ποῦ ἐνεβλήθημεν· ποῦ σπεύδομεν, πόθεν λυτρούμεθα, τί γέννησις, τί ἀναγέννησις. The author rightly emphasizes the revelation-element in this conception (p. 53). It is almost unnecessary to point out that the words of Jesus are usually interpreted in the light of those cosmological doctrines which were so popular in Gnosticism. A good example of Valentinian exegesis is that of the parables of the Lost Sheep and the Lost Coin. The sheep which goes astray is Sophia, which has wandered from the Pleroma into all the sufferings and illusions of the Hysterema, and cannot of itself find its way home. The woman who has lost the coin and rejoices to find it, suggests to the Valentinian the ἀνω Σοφία, which, in the final age, finds again its Enthymesis, which, as Sophia Achamoth, had remained behind in the Kenoma (p. 60). An extraordinary instance is the exposition of Jesus' talk with the Samaritan woman (p. 79 f.). The twelve Apostles take the place of the twelve star-spirits. We are reminded of some of Jensen's constructions of the New Testament as a Gilgamesch-Epos.

Here and there the author adduces what seem to him parallels from Paul, which are utterly irrelevant, as, *e.g.*, when he compares 1 Co 1<sup>18</sup>, Ph 3<sup>18</sup>, and Gal 6<sup>14</sup> to the Valentinian conception of the heavenly ὄρος σταυρός, in which σταυρός appears as a personal being (p. 86, n. 1). But, as a rule, the investigation is conducted with caution and balance of judgment.

H. A. A. KENNEDY.

New College, Edinburgh.



## Contributions and Comments.

### Psalm xxi. 20.

I WONDER that my friend, Professor Nestle, whose reading is so wide, is unaware that 'the covert of thy wings' has been already proposed by Goldziher and by myself. See Goldziher, *Der Mythos*, p. 137; Cheyne, *Book of Psalms*, 1904, vol. i. p. 132.

T. K. CHEYNE.

Oxford.

### Phœbe.

A COMRADE of mine in mission work, to whom I lend my motor car occasionally for its purposes, said to me lately, that the car ought to be called *Phæbe*, for it is a *succourer of many*. Now this idea seems to me to be a misapprehension, due to our Authorized Version, where, in Ro 16<sup>1</sup>, the translators have followed their pre-conceived opinions rather than the sense of the Greek; and, strange to say, the Revisers have meekly adopted the same phraseology, correcting it in the margin. A 'servant,' a 'succourer,' have led many of us to picture Phœbe as a sort of blend of a pew-opener, so to speak, or caretaker, with a district nurse; at least these are the functions which we more or less consciously attribute to her. This is not borne out in the original. Phœbe is first called *διάκονος*, by the same name as is translated 'deacon' when applied to church officials of the other sex, as in Ph 1<sup>1</sup> and 1 Ti 3<sup>8</sup>, and 'servant' when used of persons privately, including St. Paul and our Lord Himself. There is therefore some colour in this verse for the supposition that women had a position in the management of Church affairs. Secondly, Phœbe is called *προστατις*, a word in which the idea of 'succour' is quite subordinate. Its root-meaning is patronage or protection. Phœbe was evidently a Lady Bountiful. May we not conclude that she played the blessed part of hostess to the Apostle when he stayed at Cenchrea?

The whole world is her debtor for the service she did it in faithfully carrying St. Paul's letter with her on her journey to Rome. Through her hands have been transmitted some of our most precious oracles. It is well, then, that we should have a

true idea of the honourable position she held, probably in the Church as well as in the world.

MARGARET D. GIBSON.

Cambridge.

### The Good and the Beautiful.

It is not generally noticed, perhaps not generally known, that in the N.T. 'good' is used to represent two different words, *ἀγαθός* and *καλός*, the first simply 'good,' the second 'surpassingly good.' The two words are akin, but not synonymous. The beautiful, fair, excellent (*καλός*) is good in the superlative degree. The beautiful is good, but the converse is not necessarily true. It is unfortunate that the difference cannot be marked in the English Version, for thus a prime distinction in Scripture teaching is concealed.

The two words occur about the same number of times, each about a hundred times (see Moulton and Geden's Concordance). Both terms are naturally applied to the tree and fruit. *Καλός* is applied also to the soil, seed, works, salt, wine, the shepherd, the law, the fight, minister, soldier, warfare, conscience, conversation in the sense of conduct, pearls ('goodly,' Mt 13<sup>45</sup>), and many others. In one case the two words occur together, 'an honest and good heart' (Lk 8<sup>15</sup>). The moral meaning is specially apparent in the frequent contrast of good and evil works ('beautiful works,' Mt 5<sup>16</sup>). Of the two words the use of *καλός* somewhat preponderates. In the third Gospel and in Romans *ἀγαθός* preponderates. In Matthew the two terms are about equally distributed.

We have said that our inability to reproduce the difference between the two words is unfortunate, for undoubtedly the Christian life is always represented not merely as the good, but as the beautiful, admirable, lovable life (*καλός*, not merely *ἀγαθός*). It is the complete, perfect, noble life (Mt 5<sup>48</sup>). One who answers to this description is a normal Christian, not exceptional. The entire tenor of N.T. teaching respecting Christian character and conduct is such as to require a special term like *καλός* to describe it. The ordinary term would not be enough. Christian goodness is goodness in the superlative, not the positive, degree. The portrait

of Christian character in the Beatitudes (Mt 5) bears out this. Each grace goes beyond the simply good. Although one grace may be more conspicuous in some cases than the others, all are present, and all describe or imply inner dispositions, virtues of the inner life. The two great commandments present the same high ideal. In the first one the emphasis is first on 'love,' and secondly on the enhancing words 'with all thy heart.' In the second commandment 'as thyself' is far-reaching. The ethical teaching of chapters like Ro 12 and 13 is on the same high plane. 'Abhor that which is evil, cleave to that which is good' (τὴ ἀγαθῇ) is much more than 'good.' In v.<sup>17</sup> 'things honourable' well represents καλὰ. Vv.<sup>20, 21</sup> reproduce Christ's teaching in Mt 5<sup>44-48</sup>. Chap. 13<sup>8-10</sup> reaches the same height, Gal 5<sup>22</sup> is in the same key, love leading the procession of godlike virtues. 2 P 1<sup>6-7</sup> is worthy to stand beside any Pauline list of graces. 'Faith' is the 'beginning,' 'love' the crown of Christian goodness. All this, again, is comprised and exceeded in 1 Co 13. In each verse goodness is raised to its highest power, and the entire picture stands for the 'goal' of Ph 3<sup>14</sup>. In Ph 4<sup>8</sup> Paul is at a loss to find words weighty enough to set forth the Christian ideal ('honourable,' σεμνά, 'lovely,' προσφιλῆ). These instances are enough to show that the lofty type of Christian character explains the special term used so often as a substitute for 'good.'

It may be said that the N.T. standard is only an unrealized ideal. On the contrary, it is a realized ideal. The Son, the perfect man, is 'the firstborn among many brethren.' With good reason the Christian life is often spoken of as the following or imitation of Christ. With conversion or regeneration the spirit or mind of Christ is planted in the believer. The living proofs are not merely the saintly heroes of the Christian life, who have drunk most deeply of the spirit of self-sacrificing love and service. These are numerous enough. But the unknown saints in humble life, who have 'put on the Lord Jesus Christ,' in whose unselfish, self-denying lives Christ is seen as plainly as in the Gospels, who do Christ's work and tread in His steps, are more numerous still. Christ's religion and Christ's people pass His own test, 'By their fruits ye shall know them.'

J. S. BANKS.

Leeds.

## Hadadezer, King of Syria.

IN a recent number of this journal,<sup>1</sup> Dr. Langdon published a translation of a new text of Shalmaneser II.<sup>2</sup> which, he believes, confirms the historicity of 2 K 8<sup>7-15</sup>. In the course of his discussion he rejects the conclusions I arrived at in an article entitled 'Benhadad and Hadadezer' which appeared in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, April 1911. Since that article has been reviewed in this journal<sup>3</sup> by Mr. P. S. P. Handcock, B.A., Assistant in the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities in the British Museum, it will be sufficient to state here that I advanced the hypothesis that the unnamed king of Syria of 1 K 22 was not the same person as the Benhadad of chap. 20, but that his name was *Hadadezer*, and that he was the <sup>III</sup>*IM-idri* mentioned in the inscriptions of Shalmaneser II. I thought I had proved that the name <sup>III</sup>*IM-idri* could only be read *Adad-idri*, that is, *Hadadezer*.

Since the philological arguments on which I based my conclusions cover some eight very dry pages of my article, to which I refer the curious, I will be pardoned for limiting myself in this place to a discussion of the reading *Pir-idri* proposed by Dr. Langdon, and to a few remarks on the historical questions raised by the new text which he has translated.

Will reading the name <sup>III</sup>*IM-idri* as *Pir-idri* account for the Hebrew Benhadad (פְּרִי־הָדָד = פְּרִי־הָדָד)?

In proposing the reading *Pir-idri* for <sup>III</sup>*IM-idri*, Dr. Langdon believes that he is reviving a reading proposed by Delitzsch, held by Winckler, and lately accepted by Zimmern. But the reading of these men is *Bir-idri* not *Pir-idri*, and furthermore, Delitzsch has tacitly abandoned the reading.<sup>4</sup> In my article I took up all the names whether in the Cuneiform, Aramaic or Hebrew, which had been brought forward to prove the existence of a West Semitic god named *Bir* (בִּר); and I believed that I had shown beyond a doubt that no such name occurs in the published inscriptions. Evidently, Dr. Langdon believes that I overlooked the fact that

<sup>1</sup> November 1911, 'Pir-idri (Benhadad) King of Syria,' p. 68 f.

<sup>2</sup> No. 30 of Messerschmidt, *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur*, Leipzig, 1911.

<sup>3</sup> May 1911, 'Identification of an Unnamed Old Testament King,' p. 370 f.

<sup>4</sup> *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, ii, p. 642.



*Pir* is a reading of the ideogram <sup>itu</sup>IM. On page 271 of my article may be found my reasons for rejecting *Pir* as a possible reading of the ideogram <sup>itu</sup>IM in the name <sup>itu</sup>IM-idri. It was because there is no evidence that *Pir* was one of the names by which *Adad* (= <sup>itu</sup>IM) was known in the west, Amurru, that is, Syria. Let me make this clear by a quotation from the page in question.

'In vols. xxiv. and xxv. of the *Cuneiform Texts in the British Museum*, Mr. King has published extensive lists of Babylonian-Assyrian deities compiled by the Babylonian priests, in which are given the different names by which these deities were known, their attributes, as well as the current identifications of foreign with Babylonian deities. So, for example, in vol. xxv., pl. 16, we have a list of names by which the god *IM* was known. In l. 16 he is identified with *Addu*, and in the next line with *Dadu*, while explanatory notes add that these were his names in Amurru. Now Amurru was the general name for Syria-Palestine in the Assyrian period of Old Testament history, in which period these lists of deities were compiled. In the same place we also find <sup>itu</sup>IM identified with the god *Tesub* of Subartu (roughly speaking, Mesopotamia), the Cassite god *Burisāš*, and others. . . . We have thus more than sixty names which are identified with <sup>itu</sup>IM, including the well-known names of the West Semitic weather-god *Adad* (Hebrew *Hadad*), *Adad*, *Dadu*, as well as *Amurru* (MARTU). As already stated, these lists have explanatory notes in connexion with the names of foreign deities identified with <sup>itu</sup>IM.'

Now there is no such explanatory note added to the reading *Pir* to indicate that this name of *Adad* was current in the west, a possibility, however, to which I called attention in the footnote to the page.

But the chief reason for rejecting the reading *Bir* or *Pir-idri* = <sup>itu</sup>IM-idri lies in the second element of the name, i.e. *idri*. To this element scholars, including Dr. Langdon, have paid little attention. In my discussion I called attention to the large number of Mesopotamian personal names of the eighth and seventh centuries B.C., such as *Atar-idri*, *Bêl-harrâni-idri*, *Ilu-idri*, *Milki-idri*, *Samsi-idri*, etc., in which the second element is clearly the same as that of the name <sup>itu</sup>IM-idri. This element corresponds exactly to the second element of the well-known Old Testament name, *Hadadezer*, namely, עזר. The Aramaic form is, of

course, עזר (or עזר). Dr. Langdon assumes that the Aramaic element corresponding to *idri* is *hader* (הדר). It would be interesting to know of other names besides the hypothetical *Pir-hader* containing this element. I know of none. On the other hand, on turning to the Hebrew lexicon we find such names as עזריאל, עזריה (= *Azriyau* of the cuneiform), and others, compounded with the element עזר. It is true this element precedes the name of the deity in these examples, but that is immaterial. Turning to S. A. Cook's *Glossary of Aramaic Inscriptions*, we find a number of names compounded with the same element עזר or עזר: קוסעזר, p. 21; בעלעזר, p. 32; הרעזר, p. 44;<sup>1</sup> קוסעזר, p. 104; and שמשעזר, p. 116.<sup>2</sup>

In a word, if we should read the first element of <sup>itu</sup>IM-idri as *Pir*, this name would necessarily appear in Aramaic as פירעזר, in which case it would have just one letter in common with the Hebrew ביהרר, of which it is, according to the hypothesis of Dr. Langdon, the equivalent. It will be seen why I cannot accept such an identification, and why I still believe that the name <sup>itu</sup>IM-idri of Shalmaneser's inscriptions must be read *Adad-idri*, that is, *Hadadezer*.

Let me quote from page 281 of my article.

'From the side of the Old Testament narrative, the writer sees only one objection that can be raised against this identification, namely, 2 K 8<sup>7f</sup>. According to this account Hazael, after putting *Benhadad* out of the way, usurped the throne of Syria. Now, it is obviously impossible to put a third *Benhadad* between *Adad-idri* and *Hazael*, for, according to the inscriptions of Shalmaneser, this king's last campaign against *Adad-idri* is dated in his fourteenth year (846), while his next campaign against Syria was in his eighteenth year (842), and this time *Hazael* was king of Damascus, while *Jehu* of Israel paid tribute to Assyria. We must assume, therefore, that the writer of the *Elisha* stories made a mistake.' That is, in having *Hazael* usurp the throne of *Benhadad*, after murdering him.

<sup>1</sup> 'Horus helped,' or 'Horus is the helper.' Cook's note on this name reads: 'Notice the ך instead of ך (the inscription is on a cylinder from Assyria belonging to the eighth to seventh century).'

<sup>2</sup> Compare with these the names found in the Elephantine Papyri dating from the fifth century B.C., נשכעזר, נשכעזר, Nusku-idri, and עזרי, probably an abbreviated form of a similar name. Sachau, *Aramäische Papyri und Ostraka*, Leipzig, 1911, index of proper names.

Dr. Langdon believes that the new inscription of Shalmaneser which he has translated confirms the historicity of 2 K 8<sup>7f</sup>. But does it not do the very opposite?

According to the Old Testament record, Benhadad of Syria falls ill, and sends Hazael to inquire of Elisha, who has just reached Damascus, whether there is any hope for his recovery. Elisha tells Hazael to inform his master that he shall surely recover: 'Howbeit Jehovah hath showed me that he shall surely die.' In the subsequent conversation, Hazael is informed by Elisha that he is to be king over Syria. On the strength of this Hazael returns to his master, delivers the answer of Elisha, and proceeds to smother him with a wet coverlet, whereupon he 'reigned in his stead.'

According to Dr. Langdon's translation of the new text, 'it is expressly stated that Hazael, the son of a nobody, seized the throne of <sup>the</sup>IM-idri, and that the latter fled from the country.' What becomes of the historicity of the Old Testament account if Dr. Langdon's translation is correct?

Now I frankly confess that I was not disappointed when I saw that Dr. Langdon's translation so far from confirming, actually cast doubt upon the historicity of 2 K 8<sup>7f</sup>, for I do not see how anybody can seriously hope that the miserable account of Hazael's usurpation is true. But on looking at the Assyrian text I at once saw that Dr. Langdon's translation was faulty at the vital point. *The text does not say that <sup>the</sup>IM-idri fled from his country.*

The passage which Dr. Langdon has translated 'abandoned his land' (line 25), must be read in the Assyrian, *šadāšu emid*, not *mātašu emid*. The expression *KUR-šu emid* has always been a puzzle to scholars, although the context in all of the passages in which it occurs points to the meaning 'he died.' This has been recognized by scholars, as may be seen by consulting the Lexicon of Muss-Arnolt. But how 'he stood on his land,' which is the literal translation of *mātašu emid*, could mean 'he died' remained inexplicable until a few years ago, when Winckler found the expression on one of the tablets he had excavated at Boghaz-Keui. Here the writing *HAR-SAG i-mi-id* takes the place of the usual *KUR(-šu) emid*. The ideogram *KUR* may stand for *mātu* = land or *šadū* = mountain. But the ideogram *HAR-SAG* is not so ambiguous; it is equivalent to *šadū* only, and the phrase *KUR-šu emid* is therefore to be read

as *šadā-šu emid*, and translated 'he stood on his mountain,' meaning he reached his zenith = he died. So Winckler. It is true that it is difficult to see how the meaning 'he died' follows from 'he stood on his mountain,' but the context in the tablet from which Winckler quotes<sup>1</sup> raises this translation of the phrase beyond a reasonable doubt. The Hittite king Hattusil gives a sort of chronicle of events from the time of his grandfather Subbiluliuma to his own day. 'In the time of Subbiluliuma, my grandfather, Azira, king (of Amurru . . .) revolted (?) to Egypt, but later (cast himself) at the feet of my grandfather Subbiluliuma. My grandfather pardoned him,' etc. The next paragraph reads: 'When Subbiluliuma, my grandfather, had died (*šadā [HAR-SAG] imid*), Mursili, my father, the son of Subbiluliuma, ascended the throne,' etc.

We must therefore read the passage in the text of Shalmaneser, '<sup>the</sup>IM-idri (*Hadadezer*) died (*šadā-šu emid*) and Hazael the son of a nobody seized the throne,' and there remains the possibility that the Syrian king died after the manner of the Old Testament narrative. 'And it came to pass on the morrow, that he took the coverlet, and dipped it in water, and spread it on his face, so that he died: and Hazael reigned in his stead.'

D. D. LUCKENBILL.

University of Chicago.

## The First Prayer in the Bible.

REFERRING to Dr. Nestle's interesting contribution to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, February 1912, p. 258, may I ask if we do not find the first prayer in the Bible in Abraham's pathetic pleading for Ishmael, Gn 17<sup>18</sup>, 'O that Ishmael might live before thee!'? A prayer this that had its answer without delay, v.<sup>20</sup>, and which, with the name in it of some dear child for whom he desired the life that is life indeed, has gone up from many a father's heart since then.

ROBERT G. FORREST.

West Coates, Edinburgh.

<sup>1</sup> Winckler published a preliminary study of the tablets found at Boghaz-Keui in the *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*, No. 35, December 1907. The passage in question is on p. 43.



## Unbiblical Beliefs on Biblical Matters.

To the examples already given by Professor Nestle and others should be added the almost universally prevalent view that the woman who was a 'sinner' (Lk 7<sup>36-50</sup>) was Mary Magdalene. This mistake is, of course, a serious one, but there is no more justification for it than for the others already mentioned. It is also a mistake that one almost despairs of overtaking and killing. The fair fame of Magdalene seems indelibly besmirched. No wrong has ever been more gratuitous.

F. WARBURTON LEWIS.

*Aberystwyth.*

## Alpha and Omega.

DR. NESTLE (see January issue) is surely right in dismissing Dr. Oesterley's conjectural explanation of the constant reading τὸ \*Ω in the expression τὸ \*Ἀλφα καὶ τὸ \*Ω. If, as the latter suggests, \*Ἀλφα is merely due to confusion with *Aleph* in a Hebrew original, and \*Ω to confusion with *Tau*, through similarity in form (especially as written in first-century script), all one can say is that it was very singular and very fortunate that Ω should happen to be the *last* letter in the Greek alphabet. How awkward it would have been had the Greek character so easily confused with *Tau* ranked somewhere between the first and the last!

As to Nestle's own simple explanation, namely, that at the time when the Apocalypse was written 'the name O mega was not yet in use, still less as one word Omega,' I share his desire to know the exact time when the distinctive terms Omega and Omicron were brought into use. Hort, in his note on Apoc 1<sup>8</sup>, contents himself with saying "'Omega" is a comparatively modern name.' Yes, but how modern? The character Ω, as distinct from O, was adopted at the beginning of the fourth century B.C. According to Liddell and Scott, the *name* of the character O was anciently given as οὐ, leaving apparently ὦ as the *name* of Ω or ω. When did this give place to the established use of the distinctive names, Omega and Omicron? And as to these

forms themselves, strictly speaking, the former more correctly = ὦ μέγα rather than ὦ μέγα, in contradistinction to the latter. Murray (*s.v.* Omega) has an interesting quotation from a sixteenth-century author who curiously gives the two names as ωμικρον and ωμεγα, probably in a purely phonetic way.

Whilst there is no trace of a Greek text reading τὸ \*Ἀλφα καὶ τὸ \*Ω μέγα, the TR, of course, reads τὸ Α καὶ τὸ Ω, and it is supported in this by Cod. B. in Apoc 22<sup>13</sup>. Cf. the Vulgate, 'ego sum α et ω.' The quotation Dr. Nestle gives in his *P.S.* is noteworthy: but the form 'alpha et o' appears to have been very familiar and in common use in pre-Reformation times. In an oft-quoted stanza of one of the hymns of Prudentius (fourth century) we have

Corde natus ex Parentis  
Ante mundi exordium,  
Alpha et Ω cognominatus. . . .

But we find it appearing much later also. Thus in a delightful old German carol (fourteenth century) the first stanza (*E.T.*) runs:

*In dulci jubilo!*  
Let us our homage shew;  
Our heart's joy reclineth  
*In praeseptio,*  
And like a bright star shineth  
*Matris in gremio;*  
*Alpha es et O!*

Murray (*s.l.* O) quotes from the *Towneley Mysteries* (fifteenth century): 'Ego sum alpha et o, I am the first, the last also.' Neither in Prudentius nor in these other instances does the use of O appear to be determined merely by exigencies of metre or rhyme. Witness further the interesting form occurring in the Wicliffite N.T. (fourteenth century): 'Y am alpha and oo.'

The rendering of our E.V.V., 'I am Alpha and Omega,' is exemplified in Tindale's N.T. (1526). Note also Beza's Latin N.T.: 'Ego sum Alpha et Omega.' On the other hand we have the German, 'Ich bin das A und das O.' Were the scholars of the Reformation the very first to use Omega in N.T. along with the name Alpha given in full?

J. S. CLEMENS.

*Ranmoor College, Sheffield.*



## Entre Nous.

### A Summer School of Theology.

A Summer School of Theology for men and women will be held at Oxford from July 22nd to August 2nd, embracing about fifty Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion, Old and New Testament, Church History and Comparative Religion. The Lectures will be given in the Hall of Trinity College, by the kind permission of the President and Fellows. Among the Lecturers will be Professors G. A. Cooke, Percy Gardner, J. A. Smith, W. R. Sorley, G. Milligan, J. H. Moulton, K. Lake (Leiden), N. Söderblom (Upsala), B. W. Bacon (Yale), the Principals of Mansfield and Manchester Colleges, Rev. W. E. Addis, Dr. Vernon Bartlet, Professor W. H. Bennett, Dr. A. J. Carlyle, Rev. R. T. Herford, Mr. R. R. Marett, Dr. James Moffatt, Dr. J. E. Odgers, Professor John Oman, Rev. P. H. Wicksteed.

### New Poems.

The volumes of poetry which the month produces usually come with the month and go with it. But sometimes they stay. This month we have seven small volumes, all worth reading. We have read them through, and two of them at least will stay with us.

Of the volume by 'Una,' the title is *In Life's Garden* (Humphreys; 3s. 6d. net). Life is a garden. And 'a garden is a lovesome thing, God wot,' as T. E. B. has told us in a way we shall never forget. But in a lovesome thing like a garden all life's experiences may be imaginatively gone through. There may, for example, be this lost opportunity:

Just on the Borders of Enchanted Land

We linger,—culling here and there some bloom;  
From distant gardens sweet and rare perfume  
The soft breeze gently wafteth where we stand.  
We might have enter'd—you and I, dear  
Heart!

Lo, the dusk falleth—and 'tis time to part.

The next is *Forty-two Poems*, by James Elroy Flecker (Dent; 2s. 6d. net). Most of the poems have already appeared elsewhere, and many of them we have previously read where they have appeared, as in the *Nation* and the *Cambridge Review*. There is no frivolous poetry in the book. There is always

purpose and seriousness even when the form is light. The endless theme of love is sometimes touched to tragedy, as in—

### THE BALLAD OF CAMDEN TOWN.

I walked with Maisie long years back  
The streets of Camden Town,  
I splendid in my suit of black,  
And she divine in brown.

Hers was a proud and noble face,  
A secret heart, and eyes  
Like water in a lonely place  
Beneath unclouded skies.

A bed, a chest, a faded mat,  
And broken chairs a few,  
Were all we had to grace our flat  
In Hazel Avenue.

But I could walk to Hampstead Heath,  
And crown her head with daisies,  
And watch the streaming world beneath,  
And men with other Maisies.

When I was ill and she was pale  
And empty stood our store,  
She left the latchkey on its nail,  
And saw me nevermore.

Perhaps she cast herself away  
Lest both of us should drown:  
Perhaps she feared to die, as they  
Who die in Camden Town.

What came of her? The bitter nights  
Destroy the rose and lily,  
And souls are lost among the lights  
Of painted Piccadilly.

What came of her? The river flows  
So deep and wide and stilly,  
And waits to catch the fallen rose  
And clasp the broken lily.

I dream she dwells in London still  
And breathes the evening air,  
And often walk to Primrose Hill,  
And hope to meet her there.



Once more together we will live,  
 For I will find her yet:  
 I have so little to forgive;  
 So much, I can't forget.

In *Ballads and Verses of the Spiritual Life*, by E. Nesbit (Elkin Mathews; 4s. 6d. net), there is one poem that is worth the rest of the poetry of the month put together. There are other poems in the book. For this writer wrestles successfully with the supreme difficulty of the sacred in poetry. But the poem on 'The Singing of the Magnificat' has most of the inevitable in it. It impresses us most with the feeling that this is the way to express the thought, and there is no other. The poem is far too long to quote, but these three verses may be taken out of it:

The white moon through the window seemed  
 to gaze

On the pure face and eyes the singer raised;  
 The storm-wind hushed the clamour of its  
 ways,

God seemed to stoop to hear Himself thus  
 praised,

And breathless all the Brothers stood, and  
 still

Reached longing souls out to the music's thrill.

Old years came back, and half-forgotten hours,

Dreams of delight that never was to be,

Mothers' remembered kiss, the funeral flowers

Laid on the grave of life's felicity;

An infinite dear passion of regret

Swept through their hearts, and left their eyelids  
 wet.

The birds beat ever at the window, till

They broke the pane, and so could entrance  
 win;

Their slender feet clung to the window-sill,

And though with them the bitter air came in,  
 The monks were glad that the birds too should  
 hear,

Since to God's creatures all, His praise is dear.

Mr. Hugh Macnaghten, Assistant Master at Eton College, has published a volume of *Verses Ancient and Modern* (Allen; 3s. net). The note of the volume is loyalty—loyalty to Eton, and loyalty to the Empire. And once or twice, it

must be confessed, the poems are more patriotic than poetical. There is an occasional translation, as this epitaph from Simonides on the Spartans who died at Thermopylæ:

Tell it in Lacedæmon, we are laid,  
 Wayfarer, here: they spoke and we obeyed.

With it we may compare Mr. Macnaghten's own epitaph on the Etonians who died in South Africa:

Possessing all good things, at duty's call  
 We died for England; that was best of all.

The form of dialogue occurs once or twice, and is effective. Take this on

#### THE CHILD AND JOY.

I know thee, Joy.

I would be known to every girl and boy.

I love thee best.

Thou too art dear, but not beyond the rest.

Stay with me still.

I cannot choose, I serve another's will.

Mr. Percy L. Babbington sings because he must. His volume of *Poems* (Heffer; 2s. 6d. net) is inspired by any subject that happens to come his way. On the same page we have a long-lined poem about a deserted home, and a little tripping song which begins:

Though leagues of sea dis sever

Thy lips from mine,

Fond Memory's magic ever

Keeps my love thine.

The translations prove that Mr. Babbington is a scholar as well as a poet.

We said two of the volumes would live. One of the two is, of course, *Poems and Translations*, by John M. Synge (Maunsell; 3s. 6d. net). It is the first volume of a new edition of Synge's works, a uniform library edition in five volumes. In size it is a large crown octavo, and it is finely printed, as the publishers explain to us, on antique wove paper, and tastefully bound in cloth gilt, gilt top. To criticize the contents of the volume is now needless. Synge has taken his place among the immortals. We no longer give him 'Mr.' or



Christian surname. But we must not be denied our right of quotation. Take this on

DREAD.

Beside a chapel I'd a room looked down,  
Where all the women from the farms and town,

On Holy-days and Sundays used to pass  
To marriages, and christenings, and to Mass.

Then I sat lonely watching score and score,  
Till I turned jealous of the Lord next door. . . .  
Now by this window, where there's none can see,

The Lord God's jealous of yourself and me.

One of the poets is American. Some of the poems in the volume entitled *Men of No Land*, by Mildred McNeal-Sweeney (Fisher Unwin; 4s. 6d. net), have already appeared in the great American magazines. But the poems themselves are not predominantly American. The first, which gives its title to the book, was written by the author after she witnessed the procession of wives and children of the unemployed in London on the 6th of November, 1905. The men of no land are the husbands of these wives. There is an anxious feeling for assurance in religion in many of the poems, and sometimes the catching at a straw. Such a straw is the sudden vision of blue skies past the dull roofs:

Low roofs and sordid,  
And the same poor street  
Climbing still  
The well-known, weary hill!  
But oh, the radiant grey,  
The lovely, indescribable flush of day  
Where hill and morning meet!

The same little beauty,  
And labour trudging by,  
And the vain  
Truckle to common gain:  
But hour by hour,  
Lovely with light—like a forgotten dower,  
Past the dull roofs—the sky.

Colour of hope,  
Colour of June and the rose,  
Cool with the dew  
Or great with storm—spread new  
Hourly with promises  
Of good days coming—for the lonely heart  
it is  
The book of unfailing joy that never shall close.

### The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. Walter T. Scott, Colfax, Wisconsin.

Illustrations for the Great Text for April must be received by the 1st of March. The text is Is 30<sup>15</sup>.

The Great Text for May is Is 40<sup>6-8</sup>—'The voice of one saying, Cry. And one said, What shall I cry? All flesh is grass, and all the goodliness thereof is as the flower of the field: the grass withereth, the flower fadeth; because the breath of the Lord bloweth upon it: surely the people is grass. The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our Lord shall stand for ever.' A copy of Hutton's *A Disciple's Religion*, or Oswald Dykes' *The Christian Minister and his Duties*, or Stone and Simpson's *Communion with God*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for June is Is 53<sup>1-2</sup>—'Who hath believed our report? and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed? For he grew up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground: he hath no form nor comeliness; and when we see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him.' A copy of Agnew's *Life's Christ Places*, or any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series, or of the 'Great Texts of the Bible,' will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for July is Ro 1<sup>3-4</sup>—'Concerning his Son, who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead; even Jesus Christ our Lord.' A copy of MacCulloch's *The Religion of the Ancient Celts*, or of Curtis's *A History of Creeds and Confessions*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for August is 2 Ch 25<sup>2</sup>—'He did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, but not with a perfect heart'; along with 2 Ch 31<sup>21</sup>—'He did it with all his heart, and prospered.' A copy of Dykes' *The Christian Minister and his Duties*, or of Farnell's *Greece and Babylon*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.